





INTERNATIONAL HANDBOOKS TO THE  
NEW TESTAMENT

Edited by ORELLO CONE, D.D. To be completed in four volumes.

- I. **The Synoptic Gospels.** By GEORGE L. CARY.
- II. **The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Thes-  
salonians, etc.** By JAMES DRUMMOND.
- III. **Hebrews, Colossians, Ephesians, etc.** By ORELLO  
CONE. *In preparation.*
- IV. **The Fourth Gospel, Acts, etc.** By HENRY P.  
FORBES. *In preparation.*

INTERNATIONAL HANDBOOKS  
TO THE  
NEW TESTAMENT

BY ORELLO CONE, D.D., EDITOR, GEORGE L. CARY, L.H.D.  
JAMES DRUMMOND, LL.D., AND HENRY P. FORBES, D.D.





# THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

TOGETHER WITH A CHAPTER ON THE  
TEXT-CRITICISM OF THE NEW  
TESTAMENT

BY  
GEORGE LOVELL CARY, A.M., L.H.D.

President of the Meadville Theological School



G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS  
NEW YORK AND LONDON  
The Knickerbocker Press

1900

COPYRIGHT, 1900  
BY  
GEORGE LOVELL CARY

**The Knickerbocker Press, New York**

## GENERAL PREFACE TO THE SERIES.

THESE Handbooks constitute an exegetical series covering the entire New Testament and constructed on a plan which admits of greater freedom of treatment than is usual in commentaries proper. The space generally devoted in commentaries to a minute examination of the grammatical construction of passages of minor importance is occupied with the discussion of those of a special interest from a doctrinal and practical point of view. Questions of the authorship and date of the several books are treated in carefully-prepared Introductions, and numerous Dissertations are inserted elucidating matters of graver moment.

The books of the New Testament are treated as a literature which in order to be understood must be explained, like all other ancient literatures, in accordance with the accepted principles of the grammatical and historical interpretation. The aim of the writers has been to ascertain and clearly set forth the meaning of the authors of these books by the application of this method in freedom from dogmatic prepossessions.

The purpose has been constantly kept in view to furnish a series of Handbooks to the New Testament which should meet the wants of the general reader, and at the same time present the results of the latest scholarship and of the most thorough critical investigation.

Accordingly, more prominence has been given to the statement of the results of the critical processes than to the presentation of the details of these processes by means of extended discussions of questions of Greek grammar, philology, and exegesis. Hence, while the advanced student will find much to interest him in these volumes, it is believed that ministers who have not the time to occupy themselves with the refinements of minute hermeneutics, superintendents and teachers of Sunday-schools, and Bible-students in general will find them suited to their needs. The text used is that of the Revised Version, although for the purpose of saving space the text has not been printed, and the passages explained have been indicated in part by references only and in part by references together with a few initial words.

THE EDITOR.

## PREFACE.

WHAT the author here needs to say to his readers is only that which concerns the present volume as distinguished from the others of the series.

In respect both to the distribution of the Synoptic matter into sections and the general order of sequence, the arrangement adopted is substantially that of Holtzmann in his *Hand-Commentar* and Huck in his *Synopse*. Huck's 232 sections have been reduced to 202 without, it is believed, any loss in any direction.

In the handling of the matter assigned to the several sections precedence has generally been given to what is contributed by Mark, or, where he is silent, to Matthew.

Critical discussions of points in which the general reader is likely to have little or no interest have been for the most part introduced in the form of special notes at the end of the several sections. All words in Greek characters, as well as all notes of secondary consequence, are relegated to the bottom of the page, and, like the more important critical notes just referred to, may be disregarded by him who is interested only in the results of interpretation. Most citations of the Synoptic text are from the Revised Version and are printed in *italics*, while those which differ at all from this standard are placed within marks of quotation.

Considering the purpose of the book, it has not been thought wise to load it down with extended references to authorities. The author could not specify, if he would, all the sources to which he is indebted, and he lays claim to no other originality than that which consists in an

independent use of material belonging to the common store of Biblical scholarship.

The most profitable use of the book will require that the Revised Version of the New Testament shall be constantly before the reader for purposes of reference. Without a previous reading of the passage commented upon, much that is written concerning it will be in danger of being but imperfectly understood.

To my colleague, Professor George W. Gilmore, I am greatly indebted for valuable assistance in the correction of proof-sheets, as well as for many helpful suggestions, especially in matters pertaining to Old Testament scholarship, while the work was passing through the press.

G. L. C.

MEADVILLE, PA., January, 1900.

# CONTENTS.

	PAGE
SYLLABUS OF COMMENT . . . . .	ix
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	xvii
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	xix
1. THE NEW TESTAMENT AS LITERATURE . . . . .	xix
2. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW . . . . .	xx
3. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK . . . . .	xxiii
4. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE . . . . .	xxvi
5. THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM . . . . .	xxviii
6. SYNOPSIS AND HARMONY . . . . .	xxxiii
COMMENTARY ON THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS . . . . .	I-331
[For detailed contents of the Comment, see pages ix.-xvi.]	
ELEMENTS OF TEXT-CRITICISM :	
I. VARIOUS READINGS . . . . .	332
II. CODICES . . . . .	336
III. VERSIONS . . . . .	340
IV. PATRISTIC QUOTATIONS . . . . .	342
V. LAWS OF TEXT-CRITICISM . . . . .	344
VI. EDITIONS OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT . . . . .	346
APPENDIX :	
A. THE MESSIANIC HOPE . . . . .	351
B. QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT . . . . .	352
C. THE HEROD FAMILY . . . . .	355
D. SCRIBES, PHARISEES, SADDUCEES, AND ESSENES . . . . .	356
E. THE SYNAGOGUE . . . . .	358
F. DEMONIACAL POSSESSION . . . . .	359
G. SON OF MAN . . . . .	360



APPENDIX (*Continued*) :

	PAGE
H. THE TALMUD . . . . .	363
I. PARABLES . . . . .	365
J. THE CROSS AND CRUCIFIXION . . . . .	366
K. MIRACLES . . . . .	368
TEXT-INDEX . . . . .	371

# CONTENTS OF COMMENT.

---

## THE BIRTH AND CHILDHOOD OF JESUS.

	PAGE
§ 1. TWO GENEALOGIES OF JESUS . . . . .	I
§ 2. FIRST ACCOUNT OF THE VIRGIN-BIRTH OF JESUS . . . . .	5
§ 3. MAGI FROM THE EAST COME TO JERUSALEM AND BETHLEHEM . . . . .	11
§ 4. THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT AND THE SLAUGHTER OF THE INNOCENTS . . . . .	15
§ 5. THE RETURN FROM EGYPT AND THE SETTLEMENT AT NAZARETH . . . . .	17
§ 6. PROLOGUE OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE . . . . .	20
§ 7. ANGELIC PROMISE OF THE BIRTH OF JOHN THE BAPTIST. . . . .	23
§ 8. PROPHETIC ANNOUNCEMENT TO MARY OF THE VIRGIN- BIRTH OF JESUS . . . . .	28
§ 9. MARY'S VISIT TO ELISABETH . . . . .	30
§ 10. BIRTH OF JOHN THE BAPTIST . . . . .	31
§ 11. SECOND ACCOUNT OF THE BIRTH OF JESUS; ANGELIC ANNOUNCEMENT TO SHEPHERDS . . . . .	34
§ 12. THE CIRCUMCISION; THE PRESENTATION IN THE TEMPLE. . . . .	40
§ 13. THE BOY JESUS WITH THE JEWISH DOCTORS . . . . .	42

## THE GALILEAN MINISTRY.

§ 14. JOHN THE BAPTIST AND HIS MINISTRY . . . . .	45
§ 15. THE BAPTISM OF JESUS . . . . .	57
§ 16. THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS . . . . .	60
§ 17. THE RETURN OF JESUS TO GALILEE AND HIS PREACHING THERE . . . . .	65

	PAGE
§ 18. THE CALLING OF THE FIRST DISCIPLES . . . . .	66
§ 19. JESUS TEACHES AND HEALS IN THE SYNAGOGUE AT CAPERNAUM . . . . .	68
§ 20. THE CURING OF PETER'S MOTHER-IN-LAW AND OTHERS.	69
§ 21. WITHDRAWAL OF JESUS . . . . .	71
§ 22. A TOUR OF PREACHING AND HEALING IN GALILEE . . . . .	71
§ 23. THE HEALING OF A LEPER . . . . .	73
§ 24. THE HEALING OF TEN LEPERS . . . . .	77
§ 25. THE HEALING OF A PARALYTIC . . . . .	79
§ 26. THE CALLING OF LEVI-MATTHEW . . . . .	81
§ 27. A QUESTION ABOUT FASTING ANSWERED . . . . .	83
§ 28. FIRST UTTERANCE CONCERNING THE SABBATH . . . . .	85
§ 29. RENEWAL OF THE SABBATH CONTROVERSY . . . . .	87
§ 30. HEALING OF AN INFIRM WOMAN . . . . .	89
§ 31. HEALING OF A DROPSICAL MAN . . . . .	90
§ 32. A CROWD OF PEOPLE AND MANY CURES . . . . .	91
§ 33. CALLING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES . . . . .	93
§ 34. INTRODUCTION TO THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT . . . . .	95
§ 35. THE BEATITUDES . . . . .	95
§ 36. THE SALT OF THE EARTH AND THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD . . . . .	102
§ 37. GENERAL ATTITUDE OF JESUS TOWARD THE LAW . . . . .	103
§ 38. MURDER AND THE SPIRIT OF HATE . . . . .	104
§ 39. OF ADULTERY AND DIVORCE . . . . .	106
§ 40. OF OATHS . . . . .	108
§ 41. OF RETALIATION . . . . .	109
§ 42. OF LOVING ONE'S ENEMIES . . . . .	110
§ 43. OF ALMSGIVING . . . . .	111
§ 44. OF PRAYER . . . . .	113
§ 45. THE LORD'S PRAYER . . . . .	114
§ 46. OF FASTING . . . . .	120
§ 47. OF EARTHLY AND HEAVENLY TREASURE . . . . .	121
§ 48. OF THE INNER LIGHT . . . . .	122
§ 49. OF SERVING TWO MASTERS . . . . .	123

# CONTENTS OF COMMENT

xi

	PAGE
‡ 50. OF AVARICE . . . . .	124
‡ 51. OF THOUGHT FOR BODILY NEEDS . . . . .	124
‡ 52. OF JUDGING OTHERS . . . . .	127
‡ 53. OF EXPOSING THE TRUTH TO CONTEMPT . . . . .	128
‡ 54. THE PARABLE OF THE MIDNIGHT CALL . . . . .	129
‡ 55. ENCOURAGEMENT TO ASKING IN PRAYER . . . . .	130
‡ 56. THE "GOLDEN RULE" OF DUTY . . . . .	131
‡ 57. THE NARROW GATE . . . . .	132
‡ 58. THE TEST OF GOODNESS . . . . .	133
‡ 59. EMPTY PROFESSIONS OF DISCIPLESHIP . . . . .	135
‡ 60. BUILDING ON THE ROCK AND ON THE SAND . . . . .	136
‡ 61. EPILOGUE TO THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT . . . . .	137
‡ 62. THE CENTURION'S SERVANT . . . . .	138
‡ 63. THE BAPTIST'S INQUIRY . . . . .	140
‡ 64. TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE BAPTIST . . . . .	142
‡ 65. CHARGE OF BEING IN LEAGUE WITH BEELZEBUB . . . . .	146
‡ 66. REPLY OF JESUS . . . . .	147
‡ 67. THE SIGN OF JONAH . . . . .	152
‡ 68. OF BACKSLIDING . . . . .	154
‡ 69. THE TRUE FAMILY OF JESUS . . . . .	155
‡ 70. THE PARABLE OF THE SEED-SOWING . . . . .	156
‡ 71. REASON FOR SPEAKING IN PARABLES . . . . .	157
‡ 72. JESUS INTERPRETS THE PARABLE OF THE SEED-SOWING.	159
‡ 73. OF RECEIVING AND COMMUNICATING KNOWLEDGE . . . . .	160
‡ 74. THE PARABLE OF THE TARES IN THE GRAIN-FIELD . . . . .	160
‡ 75. THE PARABLE OF THE SELF-GROWTH OF THE SEED . . . . .	161
‡ 76. THE PARABLE OF THE MUSTARD-SEED . . . . .	162
‡ 77. THE PARABLE OF THE LEAVEN . . . . .	163
‡ 78. THE PARABOLIC METHOD OF THE TEACHING OF JESUS . . . . .	164
‡ 79. JESUS INTERPRETS THE PARABLE OF THE TARES IN THE GRAIN-FIELD . . . . .	165
‡ 80. THE PARABLES OF THE TREASURE AND THE PEARL . . . . .	167
‡ 81. THE PARABLE OF THE SEINE . . . . .	167
‡ 82. CONCLUSION OF PARABOLIC TEACHING . . . . .	168

	PAGE
‡ 83. THE STORM ON THE LAKE . . . . .	169
‡ 84. THE DEMONIAK AND THE HERD OF SWINE . . . . .	170
‡ 85. THE DAUGHTER OF JAIRUS AND THE WOMAN WITH AN ISSUE OF BLOOD . . . . .	173
‡ 86. THE YOUNG MAN OF NAIN . . . . .	175
‡ 87. IN THE SYNAGOGUE AT NAZARETH . . . . .	176
‡ 88. THE SENDING OUT OF DISCIPLES . . . . .	180
‡ 89. JUDGMENT UPON THE CITIES OF GALILEE . . . . .	184
‡ 90. PROSPECTIVE SUFFERINGS OF THE DISCIPLES . . . . .	185
‡ 91. ENCOURAGEMENT TO BOLDNESS . . . . .	186
‡ 92. CONSEQUENCES OF GOSPEL-PREACHING . . . . .	188
‡ 93. CONDITIONS OF DISCIPLESHIP . . . . .	189
‡ 94. CONCLUSION OF THE MISSIONARY ADDRESS TO THE TWELVE . . . . .	190
‡ 95. SUMMARY OF MISSIONARY OPERATIONS . . . . .	191
‡ 96. HEROD'S CURIOSITY CONCERNING JESUS . . . . .	191
‡ 97. EPISODE OF THE IMPRISONMENT AND EXECUTION OF THE BAPTIST . . . . .	192
‡ 98. RETURN OF THE MISSIONARIES . . . . .	195
‡ 99. AN UTTERANCE OF THANKFULNESS WITH ADDED WORDS TO THE DISCIPLES . . . . .	196
‡ 100. INVITATION TO THE WEARY . . . . .	197
‡ 101. THE FEEDING OF FIVE THOUSAND . . . . .	198
‡ 102. THE WALKING UPON THE SEA, AND THE RETURN TO THE REGION OF GENNESARET . . . . .	201
‡ 103. OF HAND-WASHING . . . . .	204

#### INCIDENTS OF VARIOUS JOURNEYINGS.

‡ 104. THE SYROPHŒNICIAN WOMAN . . . . .	208
‡ 105. A JOURNEY TO THE DECAPOLIS . . . . .	209
‡ 106. THE FEEDING OF FOUR THOUSAND . . . . .	210
‡ 107. JESUS IS ASKED FOR A SIGN FROM HEAVEN . . . . .	211
‡ 108. OF THE LEAVEN OF THE PHARISEES . . . . .	212

	PAGE
§ 109. THE BLIND MAN OF BETHSAIDA . . . . .	213
§ 110. CONFESSION OF MESSIAHSHIP, WITH PREDICTIONS OF SUFFERING, DEATH, AND RESURRECTION . . . . .	214
§ 111. CONDITIONS OF DISCIPLESHIP RESTATED . . . . .	218
§ 112. THE TRANSFIGURATION . . . . .	219
§ 113. RELIEF OF AN EPILEPTIC YOUTH . . . . .	222
§ 114. JESUS AGAIN PREDICTS HIS FATE . . . . .	222
§ 115. THE TEMPLE-TAX . . . . .	223
§ 116. THE STRIFE FOR PRECEDENCE . . . . .	225
§ 117. THE WONDER-WORKING STRANGER . . . . .	226
§ 118. OF STUMBLING-BLOCKS . . . . .	227
§ 119. GOD'S INTEREST IN THE INDIVIDUAL HUMAN SOUL . . . . .	228
§ 120. DUTIES AND PRIVILEGES OF CHRISTIAN BROTHERHOOD. . . . .	229
§ 121. THE PARABLE OF THE UNFORGIVING SERVANT . . . . .	230
§ 122. HEROD THE FOX . . . . .	231
§ 123. THE DEPARTURE FOR JERUSALEM . . . . .	233
§ 124. SACRIFICES DEMANDED OF FOLLOWERS OF JESUS . . . . .	234
§ 125. MARY AND MARTHA AND OTHER WOMEN DISCIPLES . . . . .	235
§ 126. ANSWER OF JESUS TO A QUESTION CONCERNING DI- VORCE . . . . .	236
§ 127. JESUS AND THE CHILDREN . . . . .	237
§ 128. PERILS ATTENDING THE POSSESSION OF WEALTH . . . . .	238
§ 129. THE PARABLE OF THE PROVIDENT STEWARD, WITH A REBUKE OF PHARISAIC AVARICE AND CONCEIT . . . . .	242
§ 130. THE PARABLE OF THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS . . . . .	243
§ 131. THE PARABLE OF THE LABOURERS IN THE VINEYARD . . . . .	244
§ 132. THIRD PREDICTION OF DEATH AND RESURRECTION . . . . .	245
§ 133. JESUS AND THE SONS OF ZEBEDEE . . . . .	245
§ 134. JESUS AGAIN CURES BLINDNESS . . . . .	247
§ 135. ZACCHÆUS . . . . .	248

JERUSALEM.

§ 136. ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM . . . . .	249
§ 137. THE FIG-TREE WITHOUT FRUIT . . . . .	251

	PAGE
§ 138. WARNING EXAMPLES . . . . .	252
§ 139. FIRST PARABLE OF THE FIG-TREE . . . . .	252
§ 140. THE PURIFICATION OF THE TEMPLE . . . . .	253
§ 141. HOSTILITY OF THE JEWISH LEADERS . . . . .	254
§ 142. SEQUEL TO THE STORY OF THE FIG-TREE WITHOUT FRUIT . . . . .	255
§ 143. A QUESTION OF AUTHORITY . . . . .	255
§ 144. RESULTS OF THE PREACHING OF THE BAPTIST, TOGETHER WITH THE PARABLE OF THE TWO UNLIKE SONS . . . . .	256
§ 145. THE PARABLE OF THE PRODIGAL SON . . . . .	257
§ 146. THE PARABLE OF THE PHARISEE AND THE TAX- GATHERER . . . . .	258
§ 147. THE PARABLE OF THE FAITHLESS VINE-DRESSERS . . . . .	259
§ 148. ADVICE TO GUESTS AND HOST . . . . .	260
§ 149. THE PARABLE OF THE GREAT FEAST . . . . .	261
§ 150. A QUESTION ABOUT PAYING TRIBUTE TO CÆSAR . . . . .	262
§ 151. A QUESTION ABOUT THE RESURRECTION . . . . .	263
§ 152. THE GREAT COMMANDMENT . . . . .	264
§ 153. THE STORY OF THE GOOD SAMARITAN . . . . .	265
§ 154. THE QUESTION, WHAT THINK YE ABOUT THE CHRIST? . . . . .	265
§ 155. DENUNCIATION OF PHARISAISM . . . . .	267
§ 156. LAMENT OVER JERUSALEM . . . . .	271
§ 157. THE WIDOW'S MITE . . . . .	272
§ 158. PROPHECY CONCERNING THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE . . . . .	272

#### ESCHATOLOGICAL DISCOURSE.

§ 159. FALSE MESSIAHS AND MISLEADING PORTENTS . . . . .	274
§ 160. PERSECUTIONS AND APOSTASIES . . . . .	275
§ 161. JERUSALEM ENCOMPASSED BY ARMIES . . . . .	276
§ 162. MORE FALSE MESSIAHS . . . . .	278
§ 163. MANNER OF THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE SON OF MAN . . . . .	278

# CONTENTS OF COMMENT

xv

	PAGE
§ 164. SIGNS ACCOMPANYING THE PAROUSIA . . . . .	280
§ 165. SECOND PARABLE OF THE FIG-TREE . . . . .	281
§ 166. TIME OF THE PAROUSIA . . . . .	282
§ 167. ILLUSTRATIVE PARALLELS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT .	282
§ 168. THE PARABLE OF THE UNJUST JUDGE . . . . .	283
§ 169. FAITHFUL AND UNFAITHFUL SERVANTS AND THEIR REWARDS . . . . .	284
§ 170. THE PARABLE OF THE TEN VIRGINS . . . . .	285
§ 171. THE PARABLE OF THE TALENTS . . . . .	286
§ 172. CONCLUSION OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL DISCOURSE .	287

## THE PASSION.

§ 173. THE CONSPIRACY . . . . .	292
§ 174. THE ANOINTING AT BETHANY (AND IN GALILEE?) .	293
§ 175. THE TREACHERY OF JUDAS . . . . .	295
§ 176. PREPARATION FOR THE PASSOVER MEAL . . . . .	295
§ 177. PREDICTION OF THE BETRAYAL OF JESUS . . . . .	296
§ 178. THE LAST SUPPER . . . . .	297
§ 179. PREDICTION OF PETER'S DENIAL . . . . .	298
§ 180. CONTRAST BETWEEN THE PAST AND THE FUTURE .	299
§ 181. GETHSEMANE . . . . .	300
§ 182. THE ARREST . . . . .	301
§ 183. THE TRIAL BEFORE THE SANHEDRIN . . . . .	303
§ 184. PETER'S DENIAL OF JESUS . . . . .	304
§ 185. THE HANDING OVER OF JESUS TO PILATE . . . . .	305
§ 186. THE FATE OF JUDAS . . . . .	306
§ 187. THE EXAMINATION BEFORE PILATE . . . . .	306
§ 188. PILATE AND HEROD . . . . .	307
§ 189. JESUS AND BARABBAS . . . . .	308
§ 190. THE MOCKING . . . . .	309
§ 191. ON THE WAY TO GOLGOTHA . . . . .	310
§ 192. THE CRUCIFIXION . . . . .	311
§ 193. DEATH OF JESUS . . . . .	313
§ 194. THE ENTOMBMENT . . . . .	316



	PAGE
§ 195. THE WATCH AT THE TOMB . . . . .	317
§ 196. THE EMPTY TOMB . . . . .	317
§ 197. THE SCHEME OF THE CHIEF-PRIESTS . . . . .	319

#### POST-RESURRECTION EVENTS.

§ 198. THE WALK TO EMMAUS . . . . .	320
§ 199. JESUS AGAIN IN JERUSALEM . . . . .	321
§ 200. LAST APPEARING OF JESUS IN GALILEE . . . . .	322
§ 201. THE ASCENSION . . . . .	323
§ 202. THE POST-RESURRECTION NARRATIVE IN ANOTHER FORM . . . . .	324

## A SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

WITH ABBREVIATIONS OF SOME TITLES.

- The First Three Gospels, their Origin and Relations* : J. Estlin Carpenter. 2d ed.
- Gospel-Criticism and Historical Christianity* : Orello Cone.
- The Jewish Messiah* : James Drummond.
- Die Parabeln Jesu* S. Goebel (German and English).
- Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Mark* E. P. Gould.
- Die Synoptiker* : H. J. Holtzmann.
- Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien* A. Huck. 2d. ed. (Greek, Tisch.-Gebhardt text).
- Geschichte Jesu von Nazara* T. Keim (German and English).
- Kritisch exegetischer Kommentar* (H. A. W. Meyer.) Matt., Mk., neu bearbeitet von B. Weiss und J. Weiss (English tr. of an earlier ed.).
- Critical Handbook of the Greek N. T.* : E. C. Mitchell.
- Concordance to the Greek N. T.* : W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden.
- Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Luke* A. Plummer.
- Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* E. Reuss (German and English).
- Companion to the R. V. of the N. T.* : A. Roberts.
- La Composition des Évangiles* E. Roehrich.
- A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the N. T.* : F. H. Scrivener : E. Miller ed.
- The Gospel According to St. Mark* H. B. Swete.
- Concordance to the R. V. of the N. T.* : J. A. Thom.
- A History of the Textual Criticism of the N. T.* : Marvin R. Vincent.

*Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the N. T.* : B. B. Warfield.

B.DD.....*Bible Dictionaries and Cyclopædias* of Hastings, Herzog (German, Eng. tr.), Kitto, Lichtenberg (French), M'Clintock and Strong. Schaff (based on Herzog), Schenkel (German), Smith, Cheyne and Black.

CARPENTER...*Life in Palestine when Jesus Lived* : J. Estlin Carpenter.

HAUSRATH...*Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte* : A. Hausrath (German and English).

RÉVILLE....*Jésus de Nazareth : Études critiques* : A. Réville.

SCHÜRER....*History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ* : E. Schürer (German and English).

THAYER....*Greek-English Lexicon of the N. T.* : J. H. Thayer.

TOY.....*Quotations in the N. T.* : C. H. Toy.

#### OTHER ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS WORK.

A. V.....Authorized Version of the Bible.

cp.....compare.

et al.....*et alibi* = and elsewhere.

E. V.....The common English Version, including A. V. and R. V.

LXX.....The Septuagint O. T., the Seventy.

MS., MSS...manuscript, manuscripts.

N. T.....New Testament.

O. T..... Old Testament.

R. V.....Revised Version of the Bible.

Tisch.....Tischendorf.

The titles of the books of the Bible are referred to by their usual abbreviations.

## INTRODUCTION.

### *I The New Testament as Literature.*

WHATEVER else and more it may be, the Bible is primarily a part of the world's literature, and the New Testament a part of this part. The New Testament as well as the Old is a library and not, as is too commonly supposed, one homogeneous work. As a body of Christian literature the New Testament is one of the products of the intellectual activity of the early Christian Church. There was a Church long before there was a New Testament ; the foundations of the Church, therefore, rest not upon a book but upon a spirit and a life, of the earliest manifestations of which the book is but the fragmentary record.

As literature, the New Testament is to be studied precisely like any other product of the human mind. Its foundations are imbedded in human speech, and man has no way of becoming acquainted with anything which is either spoken or written excepting through the exercise of his intellectual powers. So much of New Testament literature as is professedly historical, or contains historical elements, is to be studied by the application of the historico-critical method. Even those portions which are epistolary or apocalyptic in form have their historical setting which cannot be ignored upon pain of failing truly to comprehend much of their contents. In the Gospels, narrative, didactic, and poetic elements are so intimately blended with historical material that there is hardly a rule of literary or historical criticism which the

student of this portion of the New Testament has not at some time occasion to bear in mind.

The student of the Bible, just as much as the student of Shakespeare, is bound to maintain always an altogether impartial attitude toward his author. Dogmatism has here no place, and it should be altogether immaterial to the critic, as a critic, at what conclusions he shall in any case arrive. The discovery of the true and intended meaning of the written words constitutes the limit of the legitimate activity of the exegete, while historical criticism can properly go no farther than to determine the probable conditions under which the several books or portions of books came into being and assumed their existing forms. The scientific study of the New Testament is as objective a pursuit as the scientific study of outward nature and the laws which control the physical universe ; only in the one case we come into relation with the symbols of human thought, while in the other we seek to read in rock and plant and star what was the thought of God when He spoke the world into life.

## *2. The Gospel according to Matthew.*

The common titles of the first four books of the New Testament could not have originated with their authors, and only represent the consensus of early Christian belief as to the names proper to be associated with these compositions. In the MSS. they appear in varying forms, the name of the author being preceded now merely by "According to," as in the oldest exemplars, now by "Gospel according to," and finally, in many minuscules, by "The Holy Gospel according to." The simplest of these forms is doubtless the earliest and is the one generally adopted in modern critical editions. The preposition translated "according to,"<sup>1</sup> does not necessarily denote direct authorship, but may indicate only that

<sup>1</sup> *κατά, kata.*

the substance of the work was derived from the person named. As to the word translated "gospel,"<sup>1</sup> it originally signified a present made to a bringer of good news, but in later times it came to be applied to the message itself. It occurs in seventeen of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament in the prevailing sense of the good news brought to men through the preaching of Jesus and his apostles. In its application to the first four books of our New Testament canon it denotes a record of the life and teaching of Jesus.<sup>2</sup> Matthew, Mark, and Luke are called "the Synoptic Gospels" because they present substantially the same view of the life of Jesus, while the Gospel according to John is in large part a composition of another sort.

We have but scanty knowledge concerning the Matthew to whom tradition has ascribed the authorship of the first book of the New Testament canon. Although one of the twelve most intimate friends of Jesus, his activity as an apostle does not seem to have been of such a kind as to call for more than the mere mention of his name in the Gospel history.<sup>3</sup> It is chiefly as the reputed author of a most important contribution to the literature of the early Church that he excites our interest.

Whatever may be the implication of the current title of the First Gospel, this testimony of itself goes a very little way toward assuring us that the work in its present form came from the hand of him whose name it bears. Seeking for more direct historical evidence we come upon the testimony of Papias, bishop of Hierapolis in the early part of the second century, who, according to Eusebius, asserted that Matthew "wrote the oracles in the Hebrew<sup>4</sup> language and everyone interpreted them as best he could." The nearness

<sup>1</sup> εὐαγγέλιον, *euaggèlion*.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. its use in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, 8, 11, 15.

<sup>3</sup> See § 26.

<sup>4</sup> The popular Aramaic dialect is meant.

of Papias to the apostolic times makes this declaration of importance. It must, however, be confessed that its value for us is somewhat lessened by the difficulty which scholars find in coming to an agreement as to exactly what is meant in the passage by "oracles."<sup>1</sup> We must here be content to follow the majority of the best critics of our time, who consider that the word was intended to apply to the teachings of Jesus, considered as divine truth, and not to a composition chiefly narrative like our First Gospel. It is conceded, however, that the writing to which Papias refers may well have contained historical elements, since some of the discourses which are preserved in the Synoptic Gospels could not be understood apart from their historical setting.<sup>2</sup> The statement that everyone interpreted the *logia* as best he could appears to refer to a time already past, and to imply that, when Papias wrote, the difficulty spoken of had disappeared, the substance at least of the document being then accessible in a Greek form. If this is really the implication of the passage, Papias may have known our "Gospel according to Matthew." There are other testimonies similar to that of Papias, but they are of later date.

It is not to be supposed that our Gospel is merely a translation of Matthew's *logia*, both for the reason already stated, that it is not simply nor even chiefly a collection of the sayings of Jesus, and also because it has all the characteristics of an essentially original work. It is the prevalent opinion of modern criticism that our "Matthew" is a redaction of the *logia*, or of a large portion of it, combined with historical data from other sources. The indebtedness of the editor to the material left by Matthew appears to have been so great that, in the absence of any other claim to authorship, the name of the apostle is appropriately associated with the book.

<sup>1</sup> λόγια, *logia*.

<sup>2</sup> For instance, the passage concerning "the unpardonable sin," Matt. xii., 31, 32; Mark iii., 28, 29.

Opinions vary much as to the time of the composition of the Gospel. Its Aramaic source, but not the Gospel itself, may perhaps be assigned to as early a date as the year 62.<sup>1</sup>

That which specially distinguishes the Gospel of Matthew from those of Mark and Luke is the predominant Hebraistic cast of its contents. The author writes under the conviction that Jesus was the expected Messiah of the Jewish people and that prophecy pointed to him as the Lord's Anointed. His quotations from the Old Testament are no fewer than sixty-eight in number, taken from sixteen different books. Of all the New Testament writers only the author of the Apocalypse cites the elder Scripture more frequently. Yet notwithstanding that the book as a whole represents Jewish-Christian modes of thought, it has elements which relate it in parts to the universalism of the Pauline Epistles. The First Gospel is distinguished, again, from the Second by its greater amount of didactic matter, and from the Third by its combining into extended discourses material which in Luke is widely distributed.

### 3. *The Gospel according to Mark.*

Searching the New Testament record for possible mention of the reputed author of the Second Gospel we find ourselves at a loss to know whether the Mark of Acts and the Pauline Epistles<sup>2</sup> is the Mark whom Peter<sup>3</sup> speaks of as his "son." It is difficult to think of the spiritual "son" of Peter as the chosen helper of the apostle to the Gentiles, or of the nephew and almost constant companion of Barnabas as the foster-child of Peter rather than of Paul. It may be, however, since we are told in Acts that Peter, when delivered from prison,

<sup>1</sup> To the canonical Gospel the following dates have been assigned by different scholars of repute: 66-70, 70, 70-73, 70-75, 85, 96, 130-140.

<sup>2</sup> Acts. xii., 12, 25, xv., 37, 39; Col. iv., 10; 2 Tim. iv., 11; Philem. 24.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Pet. v., 13.



went straight to the house of Mark's mother, that the young man was at about this time first brought under the influence of Peter, that his closer relation to Paul and Barnabas was of a later date, and that still later he became more intimately associated with him from whom he had first learned the rudiments of the Christian faith. Assuming that the New Testament speaks of but one Mark, we know concerning him, not only that Barnabas was his uncle, but that his mother Mary lived in Jerusalem, where she was a householder, and that her son's proper name was John, Mark having been added as a surname. His service to Paul and Barnabas in their missionary labours seems to have been rather that of a general helper in a subordinate position than a sharer in the work of teaching, although later tradition assigns him an important position as an independent preacher of the word.

With regard to Mark as a writer, Papias, according to Eusebius, testifies as follows: "The elder [*i. e.*, John the Presbyter] said, 'Mark, having become Peter's interpreter, carefully recorded, though not in order, whatever he remembered of the words and deeds of Christ; for he had neither heard the Master nor followed him, but, at a later date, as I said, Peter, who adapted his teachings to circumstances and did not make anything like an orderly arrangement of the Master's discourses, so that Mark made no mistake in thus writing down some things as he remembered them; for he took care of one thing, to omit nothing of what he heard and to falsify nothing.' " There are several other early testimonies of similar purport, though differing somewhat from one another in details. Here, as in the case of Matthew, some have sought to cast suspicion upon the credibility of the witnesses and especially upon that of Papias, but with no great degree of success. In any case, we have nothing better to substitute for this early tradition and may at least provisionally give it credence.

The acceptance of the testimony of the early Church

concerning Mark's writing does not, however, determine the authorship of our present Second Gospel, but only of a document to the description of which our "Mark" does not well answer. Papias speaks, not of a connected narrative like that contained in our Second Gospel, but of fragmentary notes of the teaching of Peter concerning the words and works of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> That he took care "to omit nothing" of what Peter said can be only an assertion of his general purpose, which, in the very nature of the case, could be but imperfectly realised. Our Gospel, then, if properly bearing the name of Mark, can at most be related to the document of which Papias speaks only as a systematic work stands related to the principal materials out of which it is constructed. Even if, as some suppose, Mark wrote in Aramaic, we have not in his Gospel a simple translation of his work, which, as we have seen, had none of the character of a "gospel" in the sense in which we are now using the word. Therefore, even in the absence of any historical testimony to the existence of a "proto-Mark" upon which our Gospel was based, we must assume such a source if we are in any way to fit the Mark of Papias into our "Mark." The objection that we cannot conceive of the utter disappearance of Mark's primitive writing and the substitution for it of a later work bearing his name would have some force if there were reason to suppose any considerable degree of likeness between this and our Gospel; but nothing could be more natural, especially in an age when no such thing as careful literary discrimination existed, than that, when Mark's rough material had been

<sup>1</sup> οὐ μέντοι τάξει, "though not in order," seems plainly to imply that Mark simply took down what Peter said about Jesus from time to time, but did not make any arrangement of this material, that is, did not attempt to frame out of it a connected story of the life of Jesus. Nevertheless not a few critics of high rank dissent from this view, and think that the language of Papias describes our canonical Mark with sufficient accuracy.

welded into a homogeneous and regular form, no one should any longer have cared for his note-books (which, so far as we know, were never entrusted to the public), and that all traces of them should soon have disappeared.

In speaking of our "Mark" as derived from the writing of which Papias tells, it is not intended to make the latter its entire source. Ours is not preëminently a Jewish Gospel, such as we should have expected to come from the hand of a follower of Peter; it has quite as much a Pauline as a Petrine flavour. As to its date there is necessarily much difference of opinion because of the different judgments as to its authorship.<sup>1</sup> In its contents this Gospel has a narrower range than the others, beginning as it does with the ministry of John the Baptist and saying nothing about the birth and early life of Jesus. Its ending also is abrupt. The proportion of the narrative to the didactic element is much larger than in Matthew and Luke, and its narrative style is peculiarly graphic.

#### *4. The Gospel according to Luke.*

As in the case of the First and Second Gospels, so in that of the Third there is nothing in the work itself to indicate who was its author. Uniform ancient tradition ascribes it to Luke. Three times in the Pauline Epistles<sup>2</sup> a Luke is spoken of, but the name occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. If one and the same person is intended in all these passages, he was a physician, a friend of Paul, and a worker with him. An attempt has been made to connect him with the authorship of the Third Gospel by pointing out in it certain terms which, as it is claimed, would not have been used by an unprofessional writer, but only by one trained as a physician;

<sup>1</sup> In recent times the following dates have been assigned: 64-67, 65-70, 65-85, 70-80, 76, 100, 120.

<sup>2</sup> Col. iv., 14; 2 Tim. iv., 11; Philem. 24.

but it is extremely doubtful if this position can be maintained. The failure of this argument, however, does not carry with it the rejection of the idea that the author of the Third Gospel was probably "the beloved physician" of the Epistle to the Colossians.

The anonymous author has given in the opening paragraph of his book a concise statement of his purpose in writing and of the sources upon which he has drawn.<sup>1</sup> In the light of present-day criticism, if the existence of Matthew-logia and a proto-Mark is conceded, these, in case their later derivatives are excluded, are most naturally thought of as the leading sources of Luke, considering how much he has in common with the canonical First and Second Gospels. The fact that those teachings of Jesus which are common to both Matthew and Luke are differently combined and differently located in the two Gospels points rather to the use of common sources than to direct dependence; for Luke would hardly have scattered the contents of the Sermon on the Mount through his whole book if he had had before him the compact discourse of Matthew; neither would he have deliberately given to certain passages a new and unauthorised form and meaning.<sup>2</sup> These considerations, however, properly belong to the discussion of the "Synoptic Problem," which is to follow. For those sections of the Gospel, some of them important, which are peculiar to Luke, including much of the middle portion, his sources, whether oral or written, are altogether unknown to us.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See § 6.

<sup>2</sup> See the striking case of Matt. xix., 17, Luke xviii., 19, and cp. Mark x., 18. Also observe the peculiar turn which Luke gives to some of the Beatitudes and his different treatment of the genealogy and the birth stories.

<sup>3</sup> The following dates, advocated by different critics, show the range of modern opinion with regard to the time of the composition of the Gospel: 78-93, 80-95, 80-105, 95, 110, 120.

It is, perhaps, because of the tradition that Luke the evangelist was a companion of Paul that the Third Gospel has been so often spoken of as Pauline in purpose and tendency. So far, however, from Jewish-Christian elements being excluded from the Gospel, they are especially prominent in its earlier portions, which are evidently drawn, with little change in form, from Ebionitish documents. A liberal spirit pervades the Gospel, and no dogmatic temper, Pauline or other.

### *5. The Synoptic Problem.*

That the first three Gospels are not altogether independent compositions appears from correspondences both in matter and form too frequent and too exact to allow of such a supposition. The critical study of their resemblances and their differences by several generations of scholars still leaves to us unsolved the "Synoptic Problem," which, in its most comprehensive sense, is simply the problem of the causes of these phenomena. Stated in another form it may be said to be the question, "How came these Gospels to be so alike and yet so different?" The starting-point for the consideration of this problem is to be found in some of the facts stated in the preceding pages; but the whole subject is one of much intricacy, involving, as it does, the handling of an immense mass of details derived from a thorough sifting of the subject-matter and a careful study of the verbal form of every part of each Gospel. This task belongs to the domain of the so-called "Higher Criticism."<sup>1</sup> All that we here have room for is a concise statement of leading views. That there are so many varieties of opinion even among competent scholars is evidence of the exceeding difficulty of the problem. The reading of the whole history of the earth in its metamorphosed and dislocated strata is an easy task in comparison.

<sup>1</sup> Higher, as used to be supposed, in comparison with the criticism of the text, or the "Lower Criticism."

(1) That view naturally first suggests itself which is of the greatest simplicity, namely, that the later Synoptics copied directly from the earlier. Which are the later and which the earlier is to be determined partly by the external evidence of ancient tradition and partly by noting internal signs of the dependence of one Gospel upon another. Each one of the six possible combinations and permutations<sup>1</sup> has at some time had its advocates. At present there is a decided preponderance of opinion in favor of assigning to Mark the first place, which, however, some still continue to give to Matthew. Luke is generally though not universally conceded to be later in its composition than either of the other two. Some who place Matthew first put Mark last. Theodor Zahn, one of the most eminent of living German critics, makes the canonical Matthew to be latest of all, and assigns to Luke the second place. That only a year after the statement had been made by a competent authority<sup>2</sup> that the theory of the interdependence of the Synoptic Gospels is among those which "may be said to have been abandoned," the bold claim should be put forth by a veteran in New Testament criticism<sup>3</sup> that "those who believe in the original independence of the evangelists—that each wrote without seeing his predecessor's work—have been fairly driven out of the field of criticism," is a striking indication both of the vitality of this theory and its power of fascination if not of the strength of the evidence by which it is supported. It is to be noted, however, that recent defenders of the theory recognise the necessity of granting that the evangelists handle the works of their predecessors

<sup>1</sup> (1) Matthew, Mark, Luke. (2) Matthew, Luke, Mark. (3) Mark, Matthew, Luke. (4) Mark, Luke, Matthew. (5) Luke, Matthew, Mark. (6) Luke, Mark, Matthew.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Marvin R. Vincent, in the *Student's New Testament Handbook* (1893), p. 56.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Samuel Davidson, *Introduction to the Study of the New Testament* (1894), vol. i., p. 504.

with great freedom, often supplementing their testimony by that derived from other sources and moulding their entire material into forms of their own choosing. This concession is quite necessary in order to account for differences as well as agreements. Thus, for example, no close following of Matthew and Mark by Luke is consistent with the way in which the latter introduces the story of the last days of John the Baptist. In Matthew (xiv., 2) and Mark (vi., 14) a reference to the possible return to life of John leads to the introduction of a detailed statement of the circumstances of his death. Their having this peculiar arrangement in common can be explained by supposing that one of the two evangelists borrowed from the other ; but Luke's placing of the account of the imprisonment of John much earlier in his narrative (iii., 19) and quite remote from the speculation about a possible resurrection (ix., 7-9) implies dependence upon some other source than either Matthew or Mark. Luke, again, differs from the others in nowhere mentioning the circumstances which finally led to the execution of John. If the theory of direct borrowing is narrowed down to a claim that thus only can the agreement of the Synoptics in the order of their narratives be accounted for, it may be replied that such imperfect agreement as there is in this respect may just as well be explained by the assumption of dependence upon a common source.

(2) The existence of such a common source as has just been suggested was formerly assumed by many ; and this theory still has its advocates. In its most common form it postulates an Aramaic original which became a direct source for our Gospels only after it had been translated into Greek. It is therefore maintained that, by extracting from Matthew, Mark, and Luke all that they have in common, and leaving aside the rest, it is possible to recover a considerable part of their common source. To this mass of fragments there has been given, in recognition of their immediate threefold

source, the title of the "Triple Tradition." Granting what may well be acknowledged,—that the common matter of the Synoptics represents, so far as it goes, the tradition current in apostolic times,—the results thus far derived from the application of this theory are most meagre and unprofitable for the restoration of a primitive Gospel. If the human could be separated from the animal bones in the "Golden Chamber" of the church of St. Ursula at Cologne, we should still be far from recognising in the former the living forms of the eleven thousand unfortunate virgins whom they are supposed to represent. The *disjecta membra* of the "Triple Tradition" have their use, but they contribute very little toward the solution of the Synoptic Problem. One thing the primitive-text hypothesis appears at first sight to do satisfactorily,—it suggests the possible origin of a large number of simply verbal variations which might easily have sprung from different renderings of the same Aramaic original. Hereby, however, a new difficulty is created in place of the one thus resolved, since independent translations in the hands of the different evangelists would not have had so general a verbal agreement as to produce the degree of mutual likeness which the Synoptics manifest. If the assumption of a single Greek source seems necessary in order to account for the agreement of the three in those Old Testament quotations which all have from the Septuagint with common variations from our text of the LXX., it is to be remembered that we have no assurance that the text then in common use was in these respects like ours.

(3) If the Synoptic Gospels had not a single documentary source, may they not have been constructed out of material of various kinds, including scattered memoranda and a mass of oral testimony, somewhat as modern history is built up? The affirmative answer formerly given to this question no longer satisfies, although supported up to a recent time by some names of distinction. No one of the Synoptic writers,



excepting possibly the third, gives evidence of having had any such historic sense as would make possible a work of the kind supposed. Moreover, proceeding in such a way, three independent writers could not have constructed works so much alike.

(4) The theory of oral tradition chiefly apostolic as the sole source of the Gospel narratives is open to all the objections which can be urged against the last-mentioned hypothesis ; but this position is nevertheless strenuously defended by some, as against the idea of a dependence upon documentary sources. If there were any sufficient evidence of the existence of a body of trained catechists in the early Church, to whom and to whom alone was committed the teaching of converts and of the young who needed confirmation in the faith, it would be not unreasonable to suppose that their instructions would at an early day take on a somewhat fixed form, and that their language even would become stereotyped. In the absence of such a unifying cause, unwritten tradition would have assumed forms much more diverse than those of our Gospels. The differences of the Synoptics are well accounted for by this theory, but not their more numerous agreements. Such measure of truth as there is in this hypothesis, as well as in (1), (2), and (3), is not lost in the theory next to be mentioned.

(5) The dominant opinion of the present day makes the chronological order of the Synoptics to be Mark, Matthew, Luke. A genetic relation between the three is recognised ; but while some connect Luke only with Mark or his source, others relate him more or less closely to Matthew also. Whether the proto-Mark theory is accepted or not (and the present tendency seems to be toward its rejection, notwithstanding the difficulty, already adverted to, of understanding without it the testimony of Papias) does not materially affect the hypothesis. The canonical Matthew is held to be an original composition, not representing the first stratum of

tradition alone, but constructed out of materials furnished by the Matthew-logia, the narrative of Mark, and later legend, all of which the author has utilised not so much for the framing of a complete biography of Jesus as for setting forth the grounds of the Church's claim that he was the expected Messiah. Whether Mark had any acquaintance with the logia collection is felt to be doubtful. Luke, like the Matthew-writer, took his historical data very largely from Mark, or a proto-Mark, supplementing them from other sources and drawing upon the apostolic logia for the discourses of Jesus. Whether he knew and made use of our Matthew is not decided.—Such is substantially the attitude of criticism at the present moment concerning the sources and composition of the Synoptic Gospels.

#### 6. *Synopsis and Harmony.*

The synoptic or comparative study of the Gospels is to be carefully distinguished from the harmonistic treatment of them formerly in vogue. It was once thought possible to so combine the four Gospels as to retain the entire contents of each and all in their usual order and produce by the combination one harmonious and self-consistent narrative. This plan not infrequently required the repetition of one and the same account, if only there chanced to be some slight variations in the narrative as given by the different evangelists, or a difference in chronological arrangement. This method not unnaturally seemed to its advocates to be necessitated by their acceptance of the doctrine of the verbal inspiration and absolute infallibility of the Scriptures; for since, in their view, there could be no discrepancies in the Gospels, any difference of form, however slight, must always, it was thought, imply difference of substance. The first consistent attempt to apply this theory was made by Osiander, whose *Harmony* was published at Basle in 1537. Before the end

of the century more rational views began to prevail, and the *Harmony* of Osiander was soon superseded by the *Synopsis* of Chemnitz. What are called "harmonies" are constructed at the present day, but they would all more properly be styled "synopses." Their plan is for the most part identical, namely, to place opposite each other in parallel columns the different accounts either of the four evangelists or of the first three, whenever they describe the same event or report substantially the same words of Jesus or of others. Passages which have no parallels are inserted by themselves in what seems to be their proper chronological position. While those who attempt this work vary considerably from one another in their treatment of certain portions of the text, yet, upon the whole, their agreements are much more numerous than their differences. Those who compare only the first three Gospels, taking no account of the Fourth with its peculiar contents and its unique chronology, agree with one another upon all important points. Since in many cases it is necessary, from lack of distinct evidence, to resort to conjecture, it is not to be expected that a synopsis will ever be framed to which some exception cannot be taken.

# THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS



# THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

---

## § 1. TWO GENEALOGIES OF JESUS.

*Matt. i., 1-17; Luke iii., 23-38.*

THE opening words of the genealogical document which serves as a preface to Matthew's narrative introduces us somewhat abruptly to one of the leading problems of New Testament criticism. To understand fully the implications of the phraseology of the first sentence is to have a clue to what seems to have been the evangelist's chief purpose in writing his Gospel. He who is said in the closing verse of the first chapter to have received at his birth the simple name Jesus is here spoken of as Jesus Christ,—a fact of itself indicating the early crystallisation of a belief that he was destined to become his nation's deliverer and its long-expected theocratic king. All this meaning is implied in the one word "Christ" as understood by the New Testament writers (*a*). It is Matthew's design to show by genealogical evidence that Jesus is lineally descended from King David and through him from Abraham. Since it was the general belief of the Jews that the Christ was to come from Davidic stock,<sup>1</sup> the phrase "Son of David," used in a special sense, at length came to be one of the designations of the Messiah; so that Jesus, if he were the Christ, must needs be able, so it was

<sup>1</sup> See Matt. xxii., 42; Mark xii., 35; Luke xx., 41; John vii., 42.

thought, to trace his descent from David. That Jesus himself did not think so seems to be implied in his searching question recorded by all the synoptists,<sup>1</sup> *If David then calls him [the Christ] Lord, how is he his son?* With regard to the actual Davidic descent of Jesus the early church seems to have had no doubt; for, apart from the historical passages in the Synoptic Gospels, where he is said to have been repeatedly saluted as the Son of David, he is so styled in one of the accepted as well as in one of the doubtful Pauline epistles,<sup>2</sup> and in the Apocalypse<sup>3</sup> is represented as saying of himself *I am the root and the offspring of David*. Luke, in his genealogy, also makes Jesus to have descended from David, but no stress is laid upon this fact, and there is no indication that the evangelist was influenced by any other than a simply historical purpose in introducing the genealogy.

When we come to compare the two genealogies throughout, more striking differences present themselves. That Luke's order is the reverse of that of Matthew has no special significance; but that, instead of pausing at the name of David, as Matthew does, and ending the list with Abraham, he goes back to the very beginning of the race and even mentions the Creator as the primal link in the chain indicates a broader view of the relation of Jesus to humanity than is presented in the opening paragraphs of the First Gospel. Luke, again, does not follow Matthew in his attempt, very imperfectly executed, to divide the genealogy of Jesus into three sections of fourteen generations each—a scheme altogether Jewish in its general characteristics, and in its mode of development reminding us of the national predilection for the number seven and its multiples. In one important respect the two genealogies agree, namely, in tracing the descent of the reputed father of Jesus and not of Mary his

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxii., 45; Mark xii., 37; Luke xx., 44.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. i., 3; 2 Tim. ii., 8.

<sup>3</sup> xxii., 16 (cp. iii., 7, v., 5).

mother.<sup>1</sup> In several places the links of the two chains do not correspond, but Joseph occupies the same position in both. A great source of confusion is the fact that the two schemes are far from being of the same genealogical length, since, between Jesus and David, Luke gives fifteen more generations than Matthew. What especially stands in the way of any harmonisation of the two lists is the fact that while Matthew, substantially following the account in the third chapter of 1 Chronicles,<sup>2</sup> traces the descent of Jesus through Solomon and his royal successors, Luke, leaving these altogether on one side, and yielding himself to the guidance of some source of which we have no knowledge, makes Jesus to have descended from Solomon's brother Nathan<sup>3</sup> (b).

<sup>1</sup> This statement represents the general but not the universal opinion of scholars at the present day. It has been and is still maintained by some that Matthew gives the genealogy of Joseph, and Luke that of Mary. One of the latest forms of this hypothesis makes Mary to have been the daughter and not, as Luke *seems* to say, the daughter-in-law, of Heli,—it being attempted in this way to establish her Davidic descent.

<sup>2</sup> Matthew's apparent omission of some names from the royal list as given by the chronicler may be merely an accident of our present Greek text, since these names are present in the Curetonian Syriac, although absent again from the recently discovered Sinai palimpsest, the text of which is closely allied to the Curetonian.

The striking reading of verse 16 as found in the Sinai palimpsest,—“Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the virgin, begat Jesus, who is called the Christ,”—has some support from MSS. of the old Latin and other ancient versions.

<sup>3</sup> Tatian (second century) is said by Theodoret (fifth century) to have omitted from his Diatessaron, or Gospel Harmony, “the genealogies and whatever other passages show that the Lord was born of the seed of David according to the flesh.” In the best of the forms in which the Diatessaron has come down to us (the Borgian Arabic MS.) the genealogies are present, but only at the end as an Appendix. The words of Theodoret would seem to imply that the genealogies, as he knew them, made Joseph the father of Jesus in the fullest sense. As for Tatian's omission of the genealogies, it is conceivable that it was



## NOTES.

(a, p. 1) He whom the evangelist at first speaks of as *Jesus Christ* is later (verse 16) referred to as *Jesus who is called Christ* (cp. xxvii., 17, 22), and again (verse 17) is simply designated as *the Christ*. Once more, in the paragraph immediately following the genealogy, we find *Jesus Christ*, as at first; but thereafter throughout the Gospel the narrator, when speaking in his own person, uses only the name *Jesus*, excepting that once in the eleventh chapter he substitutes for it *the Christ*. From these data alone it might safely be inferred that "Jesus" is a personal name and "Christ" a descriptive title. Further inquiry confirms this impression, and makes it clear besides that the Jesus mentioned in this genealogy was not the only one who had borne the name. "Jesus" is simply the Greek form of the Hebrew "Joshua," and the successor of Moses is called Jesus not only in the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament but also in the New. Moses is said to have changed the original "Oshea" or "Hoshea" \* to "Jehoshua," † afterwards contracted into "Joshua" and "Jeshua," whence the Greek "Iêsous." According to the genealogy given in Luke, Jesus had an ancestor Jesus; and in the Epistle to the Colossians (iv., 11) still another person of this name is mentioned. The name, in fact, was one of not uncommon occurrence. Those Jewish contemporaries of Jesus who neither spoke nor understood Greek could have known him only as "Joshua." The word "Christ," so far from being primarily a proper noun, is but a verbal adjective signifying *anointed*. Thus in Matt. ii., 4, xi., 2, xvi., 16, xxvi., 63; Mark xv., 32; Acts xviii., 28; 1 John ii., 22, instead of "the Christ" we might say with equal propriety "the anointed one," or, using the corresponding Hebrew word, with which the early disciples of

due to their absence from the copies of the Gospels with which he was acquainted, rather than to any dogmatic prepossession; which again may suggest the possibility of the original Gospels not having contained the genealogies at all,—although it must be conceded that their uniform presence in the oldest forms of Matthew and Luke now known to us is unfavourable to both these suppositions, and especially to the latter.

\* In this form represented by the English *Hosea*.

† Num. xiii., 16.

Jesus must have been more familiar, "the Messiah." \* When the Jesus with whose life the New Testament Gospels are concerned came to be looked upon by his friends and followers as predestined to become the anointed theocratic king of the Jewish nation, they began to speak of him as Jesus the Christ.† At length, under the influence of that tendency with which we are familiar in our own language, the useless definite article was dropped and the adjective became a noun. In Matt. xxvi., 68, Caiaphas, in mockery of the Messianic claim made for Jesus, salutes him as *Christē*, the equivalent of "King of the Jews" in xxvii., 29.‡

(b, p. 3) Whether the belief of the early church in the Davidic descent of Jesus rested upon known facts, or whether it was only the natural result of a conviction that he was the Messiah and so *must be* the Son of David, we have no sufficient means of determining. Upon the second supposition the two genealogies are consequence and not cause of the acceptance of the idea that Jesus was descended from David.

## § 2. FIRST ACCOUNT OF THE VIRGIN-BIRTH OF JESUS.

*Matt. i., 18-25.*

In the concluding portion of Matthew's first chapter it is unquestionably the intention of the writer to represent Jesus as having been born through the immediate influence of the Divine Spirit while his mother was still a virgin. Although this parthenogenetic origin, which Matthew appears to have had in mind when he before spoke of Joseph as *the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus*, plainly makes the preceding genealogy altogether irrelevant to the purpose for which it was introduced, yet it is not to be supposed that in the mind of the evangelist there could have been any clear recognition

\* Aramaic *mēshîhâ*, Hebrew *mashiah*.—See John i., 41, iv., 25.

† Other kings had been thus designated in earlier times; for instance, Saul, in 1 Sam. xxiv., 10.

‡ On the Messianic idea, see Appendix A.

of the difficulty which presents itself to us. The reading already given from the Sinaitic palimpsest, the authority of which is hardly less than that of the Greek MSS., cannot here be left out of the account, although, by its declaration that Joseph "begat Jesus," it makes more distinct the discrepancy between the genealogy and the following story of the virgin-birth. We are thus brought face to face with two varying traditions concerning the birth of Jesus, one of which makes him to have been the son of Joseph and Mary and the other the supernaturally born child of the latter only. Luke also testifies to the existence of the former opinion as well as the latter, when, after narrating the story of the virgin-birth, he says of Jesus that he was generally supposed<sup>1</sup> to be the son of Joseph. None of the other New Testament writers make any reference whatever to a supposed supernatural birth.

The significant elements of Matthew's account are the following: (1) Mary is spoken of indiscriminately as the betrothed and as the wife of Joseph,<sup>2</sup> who, in consecutive sentences, appears as her betrothed and as her husband. This is quite in accordance with the way in which betrothal and marriage were looked upon by the Jews of the time of Jesus. Betrothal was not only considered as sacred as marriage but as being virtually a part of it, so that it could not be made void except by a legal process of divorce, which, however, might be conducted without publicity.<sup>3</sup> The most approved custom required that there should be an interval of several months between betrothal and the completion of the marriage rites. There was no formal marriage ceremony following the betrothal,—only a marriage-feast when the bride was taken home to her husband's house. (2) Among

<sup>1</sup> ἐνομίζετο.

<sup>2</sup> In the Septuagint of Deut. xxii., 24, a betrothed virgin is spoken of as a *wife*, γυναῖς.

<sup>3</sup> See Matt. v., 31, xix., 7; Mark x., 4.

other nations than the Jews it has been the popular belief that divine communications come to men through dreams. Thus Homer<sup>1</sup> represents Zeus as sending a dream to whisper in the ear of Agamemnon as he sleeps, and the Grecian warrior follows the direction of the dream-angel as unquestioningly as does Joseph the suggestion concerning his betrothed. The Homeric passage, however, shows that the poet recognised the possibility of the untrustworthiness even of such divine dreams. (3) Notwithstanding that "Jesus" is a name which might have been given to any Hebrew child, it is said to have been divinely selected for the son of Mary because of its etymological significance. "Joshua," and therefore "Jesus," is substantially equivalent to *saviour* or *deliverer*,<sup>2</sup> and the child was to be so called because he was the one who should *save his people from their sins*. The form of expression, *it is he who shall save*, points to some particular expected deliverer, who could be no other than the long-looked-for Messiah. Yet the coming king was not to be pre-eminently a moral reformer: he was to deliver his people from the yoke of foreign oppression, which yoke was conceived to have been placed upon them by Jehovah<sup>3</sup> as a punishment for their sins. The injunction of the angel then is that Joseph shall call the expected child "Jesus," because it is the divine purpose through him to restore freedom to the Jewish people and re-establish the throne of David. (4) At this point the narrative is interrupted to make room for the statement that the exceptional birth of Jesus was the

<sup>1</sup> *Iliad*, ii., 1-41.

<sup>2</sup> More exactly, and preserving all the elements of the word, *whose salvation* (or *opulence*) *is Jehovah*. Cp. Eccles. xlv., 1: "Jesus [*i. e.*, Joshua] who according to his name was made great for the saving of the elect of God."

<sup>3</sup> Very many modern scholars prefer to substitute a revised spelling, either *Jahve*, *Jahveh*, *Yahwe*, *Yahweh*, or *Jhvh*, for the traditional form *Jehovah*, which, in the midst of such diversity, it has seemed best here to retain.

fulfilment of an inspired prophecy, the words of which Matthew quotes from Is. vii., 14, though not from an altogether accurate version.<sup>1</sup> The prophet, whether having the birth of a national Messiah in his mind or not, has no thought of any child being born outside of the usual course of nature (*a*). The passage plainly has no reference to a remote future but to an event then near at hand (*b*), so that the application of it to the birth of Jesus indicates an apparent misunderstanding of its true meaning by the evangelist (*c*).<sup>2</sup>

#### NOTES.

(*a*, p. 8) Among Hebrew scholars both in England and Germany as well as in this country there is practically no dissent from the judgment that *alma* (or *halmah*) is used in the Old Testament, where it occurs several times, of any young woman, whether a virgin or not. In the passage from which the present quotation is taken there is nothing to indicate that this word is used in the restricted sense of the Greek *parthenos* ("virgin") which represents it in the Gospels. The Revised Version of the Old Testament, by the retention of "virgin" in the present passage (although giving "maiden" in the margin as an alternative reading), has been forcibly kept in harmony with Matthew's citation.\*

<sup>1</sup> On the principles of N. T. quotation, see Appendix B.

<sup>2</sup> Attention has already been called to the peculiar reading of verse 16 in the Sinaitic palimpsest, which makes Joseph the father of Jesus. The text of verse 25 in the same MS., "and she bore to him a son, and he called his name Jesus," by reason of its greater simplicity has a better claim to be considered original than the reading of the Greek text (and R. V.) which is likely to have been strengthened in the interest of the dogma of the virgin-birth.

\* Matthew's reading *παρθένος* is probably due to the influence of the LXX. The other ancient Greek versions (those of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion) correctly render by *νεάνις*, *young woman*, as does the Septuagint itself in several places, although adhering to *παρθένος* in Gen. xxiv., 43. Outside of the passage now under consideration, the R. V. sometimes translates "maid" or "maiden," and sometimes "virgin." The Hebrew has a distinct word for "virgin," *betulah*.

(b, p. 8) In the eighth century before the beginning of the Christian era two hostile nations were conspiring against King Ahaz. Isaiah (or the author of this passage, whoever he may have been) makes a prediction concerning the issue of the undertaking. Incidentally reference is made to a babe about to be born, who shall receive the name Emmanuel, signifying *God is with us*\* (*i. e.*, "on our side"), in token of the belief of the parents in the watchful providence of Jehovah over the destinies of the king and the nation. That there was no fulfilment of the prophecy in the person of the first-born son of Mary appears from the fact that he was not called Emmanuel but Jesus. Emmanuel is used strictly as a proper name but once more in the Bible, in Is. viii., 8; although as a declarative phrase, "With us is God," it occurs again in Is. viii., 10. Cp. Ps. xlv., 7, 11: "The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge."

(c, p. 8) The silence of so many of the New Testament writers concerning the virgin-birth of Jesus is of itself calculated to excite doubt as to the historical value of the Synoptic account. For belief in so striking a departure from the ordinary course of nature as is implied in a virgin-birth many minds demand evidence of a much higher order than the testimony of two unknown witnesses. No evidence, in fact, but that of Mary can be deemed worthy of consideration, and her testimony has not been preserved to us, or, if it has, we do not know it to be hers. Science comes in with its exclusion of parthenogenesis from human experience, to which it allows the alleged virgin-birth of Jesus to form no exception, not only because of its isolation, but because of the absence of all the conditions recognised at the present day as necessary for the establishment of a scientific fact. It is not the impossibility of a virgin-birth which is affirmed but its incredi-

\* This rendering of the O. T. Revisers (see their margin) and others is to be preferred to that adopted by the N. T. company, *God with us*; for although the copula is expressed neither in the Hebrew original nor in the Greek rendering of Matthew, in both it is plainly implied in the order of the words—"With-us-[is]-God." The Arabic version of the Diatessaron of Tatian reads, "Our God is with us." For an exposition of the entire O. T. passage (Is. vii., 14) see Toy, 1, farther developed by him in the *Christian Register* of June 29, 1899, art. "Messianic Predictions."

bility. If the contemporaries of Jesus either were ignorant that a divine parentage was claimed for him, or, knowing this fact, discredited the claim (and it is only upon one or the other of these suppositions that the silence of most of the New Testament writers can be accounted for), in either case the evidence in its favour is felt to be very much less than would be demanded for the establishment of a similar fact in our own time,—and there is not one rule of evidence for one century and another for another. To this it may be added that the Gospel narrative of the supernatural birth is farther discredited by being inextricably interwoven with the superstitious belief of ancient times in the divine mission of dreams and the intermingling of angelic visitants in the affairs of men. All these objections weigh against the historicity of the story, whether it be possible or not to give a satisfactory explanation of its origin and early widespread acceptance.

Explanations, indeed, have been attempted along two different lines (to say nothing of the scandalous inventions\* of some of the opponents of Christianity in the second century), both types of theory, however, agreeing in recognising Joseph as the real father of Jesus. It is urged by some that the tendency which undoubtedly existed among many ancient peoples to assign to men of unusual gifts a partial divine parentage is quite adequate to account for the rise of a belief that the birth of Jesus was not ordinary human birth. To this it is replied that the idea of demigods was one altogether foreign to Jewish modes of thought, and that the New Testament story has almost nothing in common with the gross narratives of Greek and Roman mythology with which it is often compared. This objection has less force when some of the Egyptian and Indian birth-stories are taken into the account. Others have more recently endeavoured to show that in rabbinical literature there are some traces of a belief among the Jews that the expected Messiah was to be of virgin-birth, from which fact the inference is presumably to be drawn that Jesus, being the Messiah, must have been supposed, by those who had this expectation, to be virgin-born ; but the authenticity of the passages upon which this opinion is based has been seriously questioned.

\* Reproduced in a form less gross by J. Strada, in his *Jésus et l'ère de la science*, Paris, 1896.

### § 3. MAGI FROM THE EAST COME TO JERUSALEM AND BETHLEHEM.

*Matt. ii., 1-12.*

The Herod in whose reign Jesus is said, at the beginning of Matthew's second chapter, to have been born was Herod the Great,<sup>1</sup> as appears from Archelaus being mentioned in verse 22 as his son. Since at the time of the death of Herod Jesus was still a mere child (verses 20, 21), it must have been Matthew's intention to place the birth of Jesus near the close of Herod's reign, that is, not long before 750 A.U.C. The *wise men* (more properly *Magi* or *Magians*<sup>2</sup>) who are reported to have come to Jerusalem from the East to seek the infant Christ represent a Median and Persian priestly caste, although their name is sometimes, as in the second chapter of Daniel, found associated with Babylonia and Chaldæa. They believed in a resurrection and a future life and so far were in close sympathy with the views of a large part of the

<sup>1</sup> The giving of the appellation of "the Great" (ὁ μέγας) to Herod the son of Antipater has been accounted for in three different ways: (1) by the recognition of a certain magnificence in his reign, in spite of its many cruelties and excesses; (2) because, if not absolutely deserving the title, he was great as compared with his sons; (3) by making the adjective have reference to age and not to dignity, thus distinguishing him as *the elder* Herod, the positive μέγας being used for the comparative μεῖζων, which occurs in the N. T. in the sense of "older." (Cp. the English "great" and "grand" joined with words denoting relationship, as in "grandfather," "great-uncle.") On the Herod family, see Appendix C.

<sup>2</sup> μάγοι. In the Septuagint of Dan. ii., 2, μάγοι are among those who in ii., 12, are called σοφοί, *wise*, which is a partial justification of the action of the English Revisers in retaining the old rendering in this passage, especially as, by their instructions, they were precluded from making any changes not absolutely necessary. In Esther i., 13, the LXX. read φίλοις, *friends*, and not σοφοῖς, *wise men*. In Jer. xxxix., 3, 13, *Rab-mag* means *chief of the Magi*.



Jewish people.<sup>1</sup> The Magi in Matthew's account declare that they were led to start upon their journey by the appearance of a celestial phenomenon (the Greek word \* is comprehensive enough to describe either a meteor, a star, or a constellation) which they interpreted as a sign of the birth of a king to the Jews. The "star" appears again when they leave Jerusalem and guides them not only on their way to Bethlehem, to which they have been directed as the end of their journey (*a*), but to the very spot where the young child is. At once they accomplish the object of their visit by paying homage (*b*) to the future king and offering him royal gifts. All Jerusalem had been thrown into a state of excitement by the arrival of these distinguished strangers in search of an infant Messiah, and Herod the king, anxious for the safety of his throne, had planned to use for his own advantage the information which the Magi might obtain concerning the abode of the child from whom so much was to be feared in the future. To them he pretends that he himself desires to do honour to the coming king; but they, through the inspiration of a divine dream, fathoming his sinister designs, return to their own country without revisiting Jerusalem (*c*).

## NOTES.

(*a*, p. 12) When the Jewish doctors of the law, or "scribes," \* questioned by Herod, mention Bethlehem as the

<sup>1</sup> To their more strictly religious functions some of the Magi added those which pertain to astrology, soothsaying, and the interpretation of dreams. In Acts xiii., 6, 8, we meet with a Jewish *magos* whom the writer stigmatises as a "false prophet"; and in Acts viii., 9, 11, still another, with a Jewish name, makes a great stir among the Samaritans by the practice of his wonderful arts, until Philip converts him to the Christian faith.

<sup>2</sup> ἀστὴρ, *astēr*. See Homer, *Il.*, iv., 75, where the word is plainly used to describe a luminous meteor. Unusual celestial phenomena were commonly looked upon by the ancients as prophetic either of good or ill.

\* On the Scribes, see Appendix D.

expected birthplace of the Messiah, they quote Scripture for their authority—Micah v., 2. The passage as given by Matthew is not an exact quotation either from the Hebrew or the Septuagint; but the essential meaning of the original is for the most part preserved. Seven hundred years before Christ the Assyrians were threatening Israel. The prophet predicts disaster to his people and the carrying away of many into slavery “even unto Babylon”: but a day of deliverance is to come, when the captives will return and the nation will be restored to its former prosperity, under the leadership of one whose home is the little village of Bethlehem near Jerusalem. It is possible, however, that nothing more definite is meant by the prediction than that the expected deliverer will be a descendant of David the Bethlehemite. The question of the multitude in John vii., 42, “Hath not the Scripture said that the Christ cometh of the seed of David, and from Bethlehem, the village where David was?” probably has reference to this passage in Micah, which most of the Jews of that time conceived to have a Messianic meaning. There were those, however, who believed that the Messiah would be born in Jerusalem, where David had been king.

(*b*, p. 12) It is not the purpose of the evangelist to represent the Magi as paying divine honours to the infant Jesus, and the word “worship” has no proper place in any modern translation of this passage. The verb\* so rendered in the English version of 1611 and the revision of 1881 is used widely in classical Greek literature to denote an act of obeisance, usually in the form of an inclination or prostration of the body, like the *salam* of the Orient at the present day. Sometimes in the New Testament, though very seldom in the Synoptic Gospels, the word is used figuratively to designate the homage paid by men to other beings more powerful than man; but it is inconceivable that the Magi and Herod should have been supposed by the evangelist to have looked upon the infant Jesus as other than a human child. The mistake of the Revisers consists in having retained a word already obsolescent if not obsolete in the sense in which it was used in the early versions. But the mistake goes much farther

\* *προσκυνέω*, *prōskunēō*. For an example of the use of the word as descriptive of the homage paid to kings, see Xenophon's *Anabasis*, i., 8, 21. Where Matthew (xv., 25) has this verb, Mark (vii., 25) has *fell down at his feet*.

back than our time ; for King James's translators (1611), failing to take note of the change which was going on in the meaning of the word "worship," adopted it from the old versions of Wiclif, Tyndale, and Cranmer, instead of using the better if not perfect rendering "adore" of the Rheims version of 1582. That Wiclif meant no more by "worship" than we mean by "honour" appears from his rendering of the last part of John xii., 26, "If any man serve him, my Father will worship him," and Matt. xix., 19, "Worship thy father and thy mother." So John Fox, in the sixteenth century, wrote, "This holy image that is man God worship-peth." To the present day the Prayer-Book of the English church retains in its marriage service these words to be addressed by the bridegroom to the bride : "With my body I thee worship."

(c, p. 12) The story of the visit of the Magi to the birthplace of Jesus has even less documentary support in the New Testament than the account of the virgin-birth, being referred to only in the Matthew-Gospel. Apart from this it has its own intrinsic difficulties. It seems to assume that celestial phenomena are so related to the destinies of men that he who is skilled in astrological lore may wisely guide his actions by the courses of the stars. Such faith the civilised world has outgrown. Beyond this it is assumed, as in the story of his birth, that Jesus is to become a temporal Messiah, and apart from this assumption the story of the visit of the Magi has no significance whatever. Moreover, waiving both these objections, it is hardly conceivable that the advent of the Messiah should be first made known to men of a remote country and an alien faith rather than to his own people to whom his salvation was first of all to be offered.

Again, there is the puzzling problem of "the star in the east," what it was, or was conceived to have been by the author of the Gospel narrative. Probably the evangelist had no distinct idea of the nature of the starry phenomenon, otherwise his record would have been less obscure upon this point. In modern times various astronomical calculations have been made with a view to bringing the phenomenon under natural law ; but none of them have permanently given satisfaction to Biblical scholars. The theory first broached by Kepler, that what is called a "star" was a conjunction of the planets Jupiter and Saturn in the year

747 A.U.C., or of these two together with Mars in the year following, although at first received with much favour, is now generally rejected, and no other astronomical theory has taken its place; for the alleged testimony of Chinese astronomical tables to the appearance of a new evanescent star in the year 750 A.U.C. is not received with implicit confidence by cautious scientists. There remains a possible mythical solution of the problem, according to which the whole account is the product of conceptions with regard to the coming of the Messiah which may have been derived from any of several sources all embracing in some form the notion either of a ruling or a guiding star. Although we cannot here inquire into the particular nature and value of these sources, it is probably in this direction that such satisfaction as is possible in so obscure a matter is finally to be sought.\*

#### § 4. THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT AND THE SLAUGHTER OF THE INNOCENTS.

*Matt. ii., 13-18.*

Again the course of events is directed by a dream-angel, who warns Joseph to flee into Egypt with the young child and its mother, in order to escape the wiles of Herod. The flight is successfully accomplished, and so long as the king lives they remain in the land which had been the cradle of their race (*a*).

\*The vitality of the germinating power of myth is well exemplified in the continued growth of the story of the visit of the Magi to Bethlehem. Later tradition transformed the Oriental priests into three kings—Melchior, Caspar, and Balthasar—descendants of Shem, Ham, and Japhet, and representing Europe, Asia, and Africa, the three parts of the then known world. Thus the whole earth, and not merely the East, was made to pay tribute to the future Messiah, its kings prostrating themselves in homage before the universal king. Dying they left to posterity their imperishable bones, some of which are preserved to the present day as most sacred relics in the Cathedral of Cologne. These are but a few out of a great mass of accretions to the simple story of the Gospels.

Herod, full of rage because the Magi have disregarded his injunction to let him know when they have found the object of their search, causes all the male children of Bethlehem and the vicinity of the age of two years and under to be put to death (*b*). It is implied that two years had elapsed since the first appearance of the star to the Magi.

## NOTES.

(*a*, p. 15) The prophetic passage which is said to have been "fulfilled" as a result of the residence in Egypt is Hosea xi., 1. Without mutilation it reads, "When Israel was a child, then I [Jehovah] loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." Israel (*i. e.*, the people of Israel) and the son of God are here, as often elsewhere in the Old Testament, one and the same,\* there being in the two consecutive members of the sentence a sort of poetical parallelism. The passage, which is historical in form and not predictive, has reference to the deliverance of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage, and, as applied to the alleged experience of the child Jesus, can have the force only of an illustrative quotation, whatever may have been the intention of the evangelist.

The story of the flight into Egypt is so closely bound up with that of the visit of the Magi as to seem like a part of one and the same legend, although having a different motive. If that was the outcome of a belief on the part of many of the Jews at the beginning of the Christian era that sooner or later all the nations of the earth would acknowledge the sway of the Messiah, this may have sprung from a natural tendency, often exemplified in myth-making epochs, to represent heroes as having escaped great dangers in their youth.

(*b*, p. 16) The antecedent probability, derived from the setting of the story, that the account of the destruction of the children of Bethlehem is without historical foundation, is reinforced by the weighty consideration that Herod could have had no need to resort to such wholesale slaughter, since nothing would have been easier than to send a trusty messenger with the strangers and obtain the desired informa-

\* See Ex. iv., 22: "And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, my firstborn"; and cp. Jer. xxxi., 9.

tion with the greatest certainty and dispatch. Moreover, Josephus, who has much to say about Herod, knows nothing of such an event, neither does any New Testament writer excepting Matthew. True, the number of young male children in the little hamlet could not have been large, neither was Herod a man to refrain from any barbarity to which a regard for his personal interest might prompt him ; but some other echo of such a bloody deed would have been likely to have come down to us than that contained in a single sentence of a single evangelist.

With a slight modification of the formula already twice used\* (*then was fulfilled* instead of *that it might be fulfilled*), a quotation is introduced from Jer. xxxi., 15, which fitly describes the grief of the mothers of Bethlehem whose children had been slain by the command of Herod. This citation, like the last, has not the form of prediction, but purports to describe an historical event. It is really a blending of history and poetry. Rachel, the mother of Joseph and Benjamin, though long dead, is represented as weeping for the loss of those slain during the Chaldean invasion of Palestine, which took place in the latter part of the sixth century B.C., when many also were carried away captive never to return. It may be that the poetical conception goes still farther, and that Rachel is meant to represent those of the people of Israel who, escaping the worst misfortunes, mourned at home both for their dead and those in hopeless exile.

## § 5. THE RETURN FROM EGYPT AND THE SETTLEMENT AT NAZARETH.

*Matt. ii., 19-23.*

Twice more through the warning of dreams (*a*) is the fortune of the infant Jesus directed. First the death of Herod furnishes an occasion for the recall of the Holy Family from their sojourn in Egypt. Although the statement *they are dead who sought the young child's life*<sup>1</sup> might seem to include others

\* i., 22, ii., 15.

<sup>1</sup> ψυχῇ (*psuchē* or *psychē*), the word here rendered "life," is quite as often used in the derivative sense of "soul." See Cremer's *Biblico-Theological Lexicon*, 618-624.

with Herod, we may suppose that the use of the plural *they* is due simply to the fact that the emissaries of Herod, to whom the execution of his plot against the life of Jesus had been intrusted, were no longer to be feared. Herod is not mentioned by name, but only "the seekers after<sup>1</sup> the life of the young child" are spoken of.

After the death of Herod the Great his son Archelaus ruled not only over Judæa, the southernmost of the three districts into which Palestine proper was at this time divided, but also over Samaria, the central portion, while another son, Herod Antipas, was tetrarch of Galilee in the north, as well as of Peræa in the east across the Jordan, and still a third, Philip, inherited the rule of the outlying districts of Ituræa and Trachonitis.<sup>2</sup> Nazareth was a little hill-town situated in the southern part of Galilee, about midway between the Mediterranean Sea and the river.

The residence of Joseph in Nazareth is represented by the evangelist as having brought about, through the leading of Providence, the fulfilment of a prophecy concerning the Messiah, that he should be called (*i. e.*, according to the Hebrew idiom, should *be*<sup>3</sup>) a Nazarene. In none of the Old Testament prophets (even if we include in this designation, as we may, the non-prophetic books of Samuel, Judges, and Kings) is there any passage at all resembling Matthew's citation: it therefore seems reasonable to suppose that he merely quoted freely what he believed to be the meaning of perhaps more than one portion of Scripture (*b*).

<sup>1</sup> οἱ ζητοῦντες.

<sup>2</sup> This is substantially the statement of Luke iii., 1. Josephus appears to include a wider range of territory in the domain of Philip. See *Ant.*, xvii., 8, 1 and 11, 4, xviii., 4, 6. See also Appendix C.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Matt. v., 9, 19, xxi., 13; Acts viii., 10. This usage is not strictly Hebraistic, but is occasionally found in classical Greek. See Homer, *Il.*, iv., 60, 61. It is also found in a document of uncertain date and authorship imbedded in the Sibylline verses and quoted in Huidekoper's *Judaism at Rome*, 458, verse 140.

## NOTES.

(a, p. 17) In verse 22, as before in verse 12, the Revised Version supplies the words *of God*, *warned* not being adequate of itself to represent the full implication of the Greek word.\* No other than an angelic warning is thought of, such as has been met with in i., 20, ii., 13, 19. Dreams are no more spoken of in the New Testament excepting once in Matthew xxvii., 19, where supernatural influence is only vaguely hinted at.

(b, p. 18) Seeking for possible Old Testament sources of the quotation, critics have for the most part fixed upon two sorts of passages, one embracing words suggestive of the name Nazareth and the other containing supposed hints of the humble origin of the Messiah. The fitness of the latter class to furnish an explanation of the difficulty rests upon the assumption that Nazareth was a place of such little repute that to be born in it was of itself almost a disgrace; but there is lacking sufficient evidence to prove that the little town was so despised above all other parts of Galilee that nowhere else so well as here could anticipations of a Messiah of lowly birth be realised. All Galilee, with its mixed population, less Israelitish than Gentile, was lightly thought of by the inhabitants of Judæa; but only in John i., 46, where Nathanael asks if any good thing can come out of Nazareth, do we find any word spoken slightly of the home of Jesus. It is much more probable, then, that stress is meant to be laid by the evangelist upon the *name* Nazareth, and upon that only. Of Old Testament words resembling this name and capable of suggesting it the only one worth seriously considering is *nezer* or *nazr*, meaning *branch*, in Is. xi., 1: "And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a branch out of his roots shall bear fruit." † The prophet declares that a time of prosperity is at hand, when a *neser* of Jesse—a second David—shall shepherd his people. With this passage in mind, and perhaps also influenced by Jer. xxiii. 5, and xxxiii., 15, ‡ where the same figure of speech is

\* *χρηματισθεῖς*, *chrēmatisthēis*. Only once again is this verb used in the Gospels (Luke ii., 26), and there it is supplemented by *ἐπὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου*, "by the Holy Spirit."

† The words *nezer* and *Nazareth* appear to be etymologically related, but why the town was so named is unknown.

‡ "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto



used, although the word for "branch" is different, the evangelist declares that Jesus, by living in Nazareth, became the *nezer* whose coming was foretold by the prophet. This altogether fanciful mode of reasoning, which seems to us little more than a play upon words, although most seriously intended by the evangelist, is quite in harmony with the rabbinical method of handling the Scriptures.\*

## § 6. PROLOGUE OF THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE.

*Luke i., 1-4.*

While Matthew's introduction is thoroughly Hebraistic both in matter and form, Luke commences his narrative much after the style of the earlier Greek historians. His vocabulary, moreover, has here a character of its own, embracing, as it does, several words found rarely if ever elsewhere in the New Testament, although familiar to writers of the classical period. As a whole this brief prologue is well entitled to the praise of being an excellent model of concise historical introduction. Moreover, its contents are as important as its form is excellent, since here we have both a general statement concerning gospel sources, and an announcement of the author's purpose in writing, such as none of the other

David a righteous branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute judgment and justice in the land."

"In those days and at that time will I cause a branch of righteousness to grow up unto David, and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land."

\* "Philological play like that of Matt. ii., 23, although probably justified by the real derivation of the word Nazareth, would seem like a kind of solemn trifling, did we not remember the grounds upon which the writer considered even the minutest portions of the Old Testament prophecy and of New Testament history as alike under the control of one divine Spirit."—George T. Ladd's *The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, I., 448.

evangelists have thought of furnishing.<sup>1</sup> The example of many others, he declares, has stimulated him to write an account of the beginnings of Christianity (*those things which have been accomplished among us*) for the satisfaction of one whom, as if dedicating to him his work, he directly addresses as *most excellent Theophilus* (*a*).

Luke's "many" is too comprehensive a term to be limited to Matthew and Mark, and must be taken as testifying to the existence, in his time, of Christian documents in historical form beyond the number which have come down to us. Without forcing the meaning of the text we cannot assert, as some have done, that our "apocryphal" gospels and those considered by the early church "heretical" belong to the group of writings which the evangelist had in mind. All that we are clearly told is that these documents, while not emanating from apostles or other eye-witnesses, made use of testimony derived from sources of this high order. Such conditions would allow of the Mark-Gospel being one of the writings referred to, the teachings of the apostle Peter having been its source: neither would our present Matthew need to be excluded, it being, as we have already seen, only indirectly and in part an apostolic work. When the early propagators of Christianity whose personal testimony was made use of by "many" writers are spoken of as *ministers of the word*, the phrase *logos*, or "word," in the new and special sense attached to it in Christian speech, meant the teachings of Jesus and the story of his life. Later, in the first sentences of the Johannine Gospel, we find the phrase representing a very different circle of ideas, having become charged with a metaphysical meaning quite foreign to the simple conceptions of the Synoptics. The knowledge which the *eye-witnesses* had *from the beginning*<sup>2</sup> was a knowledge

<sup>1</sup> The author of the Fourth Gospel mentions his doctrinal but not his historical purpose. See John xx., 31.

<sup>2</sup> ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, *ap' archēs*. Cp. John xv., 27, where Jesus says to his

of the public career of Jesus from about the time when they severally became his disciples. When Luke says that, previous to writing, he has carefully traced up the entire course of events, he uses another more general phrase,<sup>1</sup> fitted to cover the entire period embraced in his history. So far, however, as he treats of events lying beyond the range of the personal knowledge of the "eye-witnesses," as in the case of the birth-stories, there is no reason to suppose that any other evidence was available than that of popular tradition, the accuracy of which might be incapable of verification. The evangelist's purpose to present facts in their true chronological relations is evident from his employment of a phrase<sup>2</sup> which denotes orderly succession, or at least continuity of narration as opposed to a fragmentary treatment of his subject. Even though it should appear that he has sometimes been dominated by logical rather than chronological considerations, the fact of his historical purpose will still remain, however much he may have come short of consistently carrying out his declared intention.

## NOTE.

(a, p. 21) Who Theophilus was is purely a matter of conjecture. Since three times in Acts (xxiii., 26, xxiv., 3, xxviii.,

disciples, "And ye also bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." In Mark i., 1, the ἀρχή includes the ministry of John the Baptist considered as the forerunner of Jesus. In Acts i., 21, 22, the baptism by John is considered the initial fact in the public life of Jesus to which a chosen apostle must be able to testify. Likewise in Acts x., 37, the whole career of John is looked upon as being the beginning of the new dispensation. In Acts xiii., 24, John's ministry is spoken of rather as the antecedent of that of Jesus than as a part of it.

<sup>1</sup> ἀνωθεν, *anōthēn*. Cp. Acts xxvi., 5, where the word is equivalent to "from my youth up" in the preceding verse.

<sup>2</sup> καθεξῆς, *kathēxēs*, = "in order," or, perhaps better, "continuously."

25) "*most excellent*," is used like the English "your Excellency," in addressing governors, it would seem not unlikely that Theophilus was a man in high station; but the force of this consideration is weakened by the fact that in Acts i., 1, in addressing the same Theophilus, Luke altogether omits the complimentary adjective. The name is possibly a pseudonyme adopted for the purpose of concealing the identity of the one addressed.

## § 7. ANGELIC PROMISE OF THE BIRTH OF JOHN THE BAPTIST

*Luke i., 5-25.*

When the events of this section are placed *in the days of Herod, king of Judæa*, it is meant to confine them within the limits of the reign of Herod the Great; but it is only through the relation of these events to the birth of Jesus, of which an account is given in subsequent sections, that we are able to assign them to the latter part of this reign, when, according to Matthew, Jesus was born. Luke appears sometimes, as here, to include under the name Judæa all Palestine<sup>1</sup>; though it is possible that at this time he is thinking of Herod only as a ruler of the particular province in which the events which he is about to describe took place. David, according to tradition,<sup>2</sup> had divided the priests into twenty-four "courses" or classes, of which the course of Abijah was the eighth.<sup>3</sup> Each course served in the temple for one week twice a year. To Zacharias<sup>4</sup> and Elisabeth is ascribed not only a common descent from Aaron, the first great high-priest, but also the personal merit of steadfast obedience to the divine will, by virtue of which faithfulness they were entitled to be

<sup>1</sup> Palestine is not a N. T. word.

<sup>2</sup> See 1 Chron. xxiv., 3; 2 Chron. viii., 14; Neh. xii., 24.

<sup>3</sup> See 1 Chron. xxiv., 10.

<sup>4</sup> Zacharias = the O. T. Zechariah.

called *righteous before*<sup>1</sup> [*i. e.*, in the judgment of] *God (a)*. As to their age at this time nothing can be determined. The Greek phrase rendered *well stricken in years* means no more than "advanced in life." *Reproach*, in verse 25, applied to Elisabeth's childlessness, represents a Greek word which is said to have been originally quite colourless, meaning nothing more than "reputation," "what people say of one."

As the temple was the house of God, to officiate in the temple was, in a certain sense, to appear *before God*. The word<sup>2</sup> translated *temple* in verse 9 (in the margin, *sanctuary*) indicates that part of the temple-structure set apart for the offering of burnt-incense,<sup>3</sup> where only the priest entered. While he was making the offering, the people remained in the outer court engaged in prayer. The *angel* [or "messenger"] *of the Lord (b)* does not in Luke, as in Matthew, appear<sup>4</sup> "in a dream." The conception is now of a distinctly corporeal presence, while the apparition in dreams suggests something shadowy, and, though real, less substantial. It is the difference between a waking and a sleeping vision. The *supplication* of Zacharias (verse 13) is most naturally understood of his desire for the birth of a son, the rest of the sentence indicating what is to be the answer to his prayer. In calling the child John (Heb., *Johanan* = to whom Jehovah is gracious, or whom Jehovah has graciously given), there would be a recognition of God's favour in removing

<sup>1</sup> ἐναντίον, *enantion*. Cp. LXX., Gen. x., 9, where Nimrod is called a mighty hunter before (*enantion*) the Lord. The phrase denotes superiority. If in the judgment of God one is great, he must be great indeed.

<sup>2</sup> ναός, *naos*.

<sup>3</sup> Directions for the construction of the altar and the burning of incense are found in Ex. xxx., 1 ff.; also for the preparation of the incense in verses 34-38 of the same chapter. Cp. Ex. xxxvii., 25-29.

<sup>4</sup> Luke's expression is ὡφθη, *was seen*; Matthew's, φαίναται, *appears*. Our translators do not recognise the difference,

from them the misfortune of childlessness and thereby giving them *joy and gladness*. Although many would *rejoice at his birth*, it is not for this that Zacharias is represented as praying. *In the sight of* (verse 10)<sup>1</sup> is equivalent to *before* in verse 6.<sup>2</sup> *To drink no wine or strong drink* was required of the Nazarite who had made a vow to "separate himself unto the Lord."<sup>3</sup> It is implied that John is to be a Nazarite from birth and through his whole life, like Samson<sup>4</sup> and Samuel,<sup>5</sup> although no mention is made of the other rule of the Nazarite life which forbade the cutting of the hair. It is predicted of John that he will be a moral reformer, leading back many of his countrymen to the worship and service of Jehovah, from which they have departed. This is to be done as a preparation for the bringing in of the Messiah's kingdom; for although *his* in verse 17 refers grammatically to *the Lord their God* in the preceding verse, in the writer's thought it is the Messianic representative of Jehovah of whom John is to be the precursor. In the prophetic language of the first part of Is. xl., portions of which are quoted in Mark i. and Luke iii., as applicable to John, only some manifestation of the power of Jehovah is thought of, and not His personal appearing. The mission of John is to be executed *in the spirit and power of Elijah*; that is to say, he will be a second Elijah (*c*).

The most prominent literary characteristic of this section is the marked Hebrew tinge both of thought and expression, which distinguishes it strikingly from the Prologue. The historical elements which it furnishes prove, upon examination, to have little value for the fixing of the exact date of

<sup>1</sup> ἐν ὧπιον, ἐνώπιον.

<sup>2</sup> See Note I, page 24. In verse 17 the context requires ἐν ὧπιον αὐτοῦ to be rendered *before him* (R. V. *before his face*) in a local sense, the conception being of a herald preparing the way for the advent of royalty.

<sup>3</sup> Num. vi., 2 ff. Cp. Judg. xiii., 5, 7.

<sup>4</sup> Judg. xiii., 6.

<sup>5</sup> I Sam. i., 11.

the birth of John, since adequate information is wanting as to the time of the service of the course of Abijah here referred to. How much of historical verity there is in the account it is not easy to determine. The birth of a child to previously childless parents somewhat advanced in years, however unusual, is not incredible : but this part of the story (including the prediction of the angel) bears such a close resemblance to the account of the birth of a child to Abraham and Sarah in their old age (Gen. xvii., 16 ff., xviii., 10 ff. Cp. Rom. iv., 19) that an imitation of this account in early Christian legend is easily imaginable. The asking for a sign (verse 18) is also conceived in the spirit of the mythical element of the early Hebrew historiography. Cp. Gen. xv., 8. The relation which the ministry of Jesus was believed to have sustained to that of the Baptist was so vital that, given the story of the miraculous birth of the former, the growth of an additional legend concerning his forerunner would be nothing unnatural. Luke's later writing and more careful research have preserved to us a Christian mythology going back of that of Matthew in its subject, and also, as will presently appear, much richer in its development than the simple story of the First Gospel.

## NOTES.

(a, p. 24) In Matt. i., 19, if Joseph is called "*righteous*" \* because of his refraining from invoking the penalty of the law upon his betrothed for her supposed unfaithfulness, such forbearance is at least considered especially becoming to "a righteous man." Cp. Gen. vii., 1. Here there is no thought of the righteousness of the Pauline theology, but rather of "the righteousness which is of the law," which the apostle (Rom. x., 5, 6) contrasts with "the righteousness which is of faith." Compare the phraseology of Phil. iii., 6, "as touching the righteousness which is in the law, found blameless."

\* *δίκαιος, dikaios.*

(b, p. 24) Angels were conceived by the Hebrews as manifesting themselves in human form. Under circumstances similar to those which lie at the foundation of the present narrative (see Judg. xiii., 2 ff.), "the angel of the Lord" appears unto the wife of Manoah and promises her a son (Samson); whereupon she goes and tells her husband that "a man of God," whose countenance was "like the countenance of the angel of God, very terrible," had come to her and assured her of the birth of a son. Throughout the chapter "the man of God," "the angel of God," "the angel of the Lord," and "the man," are used interchangeably, "angel of the Lord" preponderating. At the very last (verse 22) the angel is identified with God Himself. In Dan. ix., 21, the angel Gabriel is spoken of as "the man Gabriel"; and the word Gabriel means "strong-man god," or "hero-god." Angels appear not to have been known by name among the Jews prior to the time of the exile, neither were they conceived of as being of different ranks. Gabriel, who here (verse 19) speaks of himself as standing *in the presence of God*, that is, ministering near His throne and so being a messenger of the highest rank, was not the only one having this high privilege. In Tobit xii., 15, Raphael proclaims himself to be "one of the seven holy angels, which present the prayers of the saints, and which go in and out before the glory of the Holy One." Some reckoned only four of these highest angels, or "archangels," stationing one at each of the four sides of the throne of God.

(c, p. 25) Mal. iv., 5, 6, had led the Jews to look for a second coming of Elijah before the advent of the Messiah, and it is this passage\* which furnished the foundation for verse 17. While the Old Testament original appears to be a prediction of the establishment of domestic harmony in the time which the prophet has in mind, Luke so alters the phraseology as to mutilate this thought and to introduce the additional idea of a moral renovation of the faithless portion of the people of Israel, thus emphasising by repetition the thought of the preceding verse.

\* "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord come. And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers; lest I come and smite the earth with a curse."—Cp. Ecclus. xlviii., 10.



## § 8. PROPHETIC ANNOUNCEMENT TO MARY OF THE VIRGIN-BIRTH OF JESUS.

*Luke i., 26-38.*

Instead of the brief angelic communication to Joseph contained in Matthew's account of the birth of Jesus (§ 2), Luke, in this section, reports a much earlier and much fuller annunciation to Mary, who is represented as consenting in advance to become the subject of the miracle. Here, as in the preceding annunciation to Zacharias, the messenger is no longer a dream, but the angel Gabriel. Bringing together verses 24, 26, and 36, the inference may be drawn that the difference between the ages of John and Jesus was about six months. From Matt. ii., 1, the impression is derived that Joseph and Mary were inhabitants of Bethlehem in Judæa, while Luke makes Nazareth<sup>1</sup> in Galilee their home and only brings them to Bethlehem upon a visit just before the birth of Jesus. See Luke ii., 1-7. The salutation of the angel (verse 28) is the common Greek *chaire*, "rejoice," of which the old English "hail" is usually an approximate equivalent.<sup>2</sup> In verses 32 and 35 it is better that *Son of the Most High* and *Son of God*<sup>3</sup> should stand without the prefixed definite article, which is lacking in the original. In what sense the promised child is to be "Son of the Most High" is indicated in what immediately follows. His sonship will consist in his being the anointed king of the Jewish people.

<sup>1</sup> There is MS. authority for the forms *Nazaret* and *Nazara*.

<sup>2</sup> "Hail, favoured one," would be a more forcible as well as a more exact rendering of *χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη* than that of the A. V. and the R. V. The participle is explained by *εὗρες γὰρ χάριν* (*for thou hast found favour*) κ. τ. λ. in verse 30. The last clause of the verse may be a part of the salutation, in which case "be" and not "is" must be supplied. Cp. Rom. xv., 33.

<sup>3</sup> In the *Apology* of Aristides (between A.D. 117 and 138) these designations are combined into "Son of God Most High."

In John i., 49, there is confirmation of this in the words of Nathanael addressed to Jesus himself: "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art King of Israel." So in Matt. xvi., 16, "Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," and in xxvi., 63, the high-priest adjures Jesus to tell him whether he is "the Christ, the Son of God." Even the language ascribed to demoniacs is in harmony with this usage (see Luke iv., 41). In Ps. ii., 7, Jehovah is represented as saying to the anointed king of Israel, "Thou art my son: this day [*i. e.*, apparently, on the day of his establishment upon the throne] have I begotten thee"; and three times in the New Testament<sup>1</sup> this passage is made to apply to Jesus, although those quoting it do not take it in its original sense but give to it a mystical meaning. The language of the angel is a plain prediction of the temporal Messiahship of Jesus. Cp. Matt. i., 21. In verse 35, as in Matt. i., 18, 20, there is, in the Greek, no article before "Holy Spirit," and, although the special influence of the Deity is implied, there is no conception of the "Spirit" as a distinct personality (*a*). Here the divine origin of Jesus and not his Messianic dignity is given as the reason for his being called "Son of God."

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 29) "Holy Spirit" throughout the Synoptics is equivalent to "the spirit of God," or "the Divine Spirit," spoken of here in verse 35 as "the power of the Most High." Never has the Hebrew mind been able to accept the idea of a division of personality in the Divine nature, neither had the conception of a personal Holy Spirit been developed in the Christian church at the time of the writing of our Gospels. It is not to be lost sight of that we have here to deal with ideas held by men who were Jews before they were Christians.

<sup>1</sup> Acts. xiii., 33; Heb. i., 5, v., 5.

## § 9. MARY'S VISIT TO ELISABETH.

*Luke i., 39-56.*

Mary, having been informed by Gabriel (verse 36) of the prospective birth of a son to Elisabeth, departs from her home in Galilee and journeys southward to pay a visit to her kinswoman. The unborn John leaps for joy at the coming of her who is to be the mother of the Messiah. Elisabeth, speaking under the influence of the Divine Spirit, testifies to this, and, as if aware of what has been said to Mary by the angel, affirms its certain fulfilment. She even speaks of Mary as *the mother of my Lord*, thus recognising the Messiahship of the unborn Jesus and (verse 43) finding in her young kinswoman one who by this visit honours her beyond her desert. Then Mary pours out her soul in a lofty strain of thanksgiving (verses 46-55). 'This song,' from the word with which it begins in the Latin Vulgate version, is known throughout the Christian church as the "*Magnificat*."<sup>2</sup> Both thought and phraseology are derived from Old Testament sources.<sup>3</sup> The opening verses and the spirit of the whole are closely related to the song of Hannah in the second chapter of the first book of Samuel. Under similar circumstances Hannah thanked God for giving unto His handmaid a man-child and so shutting the mouths of scoffers. The first words both of Hannah and of Mary are words of thankfulness mingled with exultation.<sup>4</sup> Between *soul*<sup>5</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> A division into four strophes or stanzas has been suggested, as follows: (1) 46-48, (2) 49, 50, (3) 51-53, (4) 54, 55.

<sup>2</sup> The *Magnificat* forms a part of every vesper service in the church of Rome, where it has probably been in use for nearly if not quite fourteen centuries. It is also used in the worship of the Anglican and Lutheran churches.

<sup>3</sup> Westcott and Hort make half the matter direct quotation.

<sup>4</sup> A like feeling of gratitude finds similar expression in the first part of Ps. xxxiv.

<sup>5</sup> *ψυχή*.

*spirit*<sup>1</sup> no distinction is here to be drawn, the variation being simply rhetorical and in the interest of poetic parallelism.<sup>2</sup> *Hath rejoiced in God my saviour* is paralleled by 1 Sam. i., 1, "I rejoice in thy salvation," and Ps. xxxv., 9, "And my soul shall be joyful in the Lord, it shall rejoice in His salvation."<sup>3</sup> The salvation in which Mary and Hannah rejoiced was the deliverance from childlessness, which state Mary speaks of as an "humiliation."<sup>4</sup> Exultation was to take the place of abasement, Mary declaring that henceforth all generations would consider her most fortunate in having been thus chosen to be the mother of the Messiah. In saying that the Lord had done to her *great things*, Mary but echoes the language of Ps. lxxi., 19: "Thou [God] who hast done great things." So *holy is his name* reproduces a part of Ps. cxi., 9: "Holy and reverend is his name."

## § 10. BIRTH OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

*Luke i., 57-80.*

To the legends of prophetic annunciation (§§ 7, 8) Luke now adds legends with regard to the birth of John and Jesus. The child of Zacharias and Elisabeth is made an heir of the covenant established between Jehovah and the patriarch Abraham by submission to the rite prescribed in Gen. xvii., 9-14. At the same time he receives a name, according to custom,—the name predicted by the angel in verse 13. When it is said that Zacharias, filled with the Holy Spirit, as Elisabeth had been on the occasion of the visit of Mary,

<sup>1</sup> πνεῦμα.

<sup>2</sup> "Heart" is used in place of both words in 1 Sam. i., 1.

<sup>3</sup> To *magnify* [*i. e.*, praise] *the Lord* is a form of expression occurring elsewhere only in Acts x., 46.

<sup>4</sup> ταπεινώσις, *tapēinōsis* (A. V. and R. V., *low estate*): not found elsewhere in the N. T. in this exact sense.

*prophesied*, the foretelling of future events is not alone indicated (a). His words (verses 68-79) constitute a song of praise ending in a prediction of the grandeur of the mission of the new-born child.<sup>1</sup> It is the "*Benedictus*" of the Christian church, so named from its first word in the Latin Vulgate version.<sup>2</sup> No passage in the Gospels is more thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the Messianic hope than this. Zacharias blesses the Lord for a salvation which the delusive eagerness of his hope sees already accomplished—*salvation from our enemies and from the hand of all that hate us*.<sup>3</sup> This hope had been fed upon the promise which Jehovah made to Abraham, "thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies,"<sup>4</sup> of which Luke's 74th verse is an echo. While the moral character of the Messianic kingdom is also plainly indicated here (verse 75) as elsewhere, national liberty is invariably thought of as the antecedent condition of that service of God *without fear, in holiness and righteousness*, which is to constitute the crowning glory of the national life under the reign of the Son of David. Yet in verse 77 *the remission of their sins* has not primarily an ethical meaning, since the thought is first of all of release from that national degradation which was conceived to be the penalty of the people's wrong-doing<sup>5</sup>; and the *way of peace* (verse 79) in which their feet are to be guided is more an earthly than a heavenly peace.

<sup>1</sup> The song is divisible into five strophes, as follows: (1) 68-69, (2) 70-72, (3) 73-75, (4) 76, 77, (5) 78, 79.

<sup>2</sup> "Praised" is a closer rendering of *εὐλογητός* than *blessed*. The Hebrew word of which it is the Septuagint equivalent means primarily "to bend the knee" as in worship. See Ps. xciv., 6 (LXX., xciv.). ciii., 1, 2 (LXX., cii.), civ., 1 (LXX., ciii.).

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Ps. xviii., 17, cvi., 10.

<sup>4</sup> Gen. xxii., 17.

<sup>5</sup> It follows that there is no ground for the opinion of Hilgenfeld that this passage was written in the interest of the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith.

Only a single verse (76) is predictive of a future event.<sup>1</sup>

## NOTE.

(a, p. 32) The verb *prōphēteuō*\* originally signified to *speak for*, and the *prōphētēs*† or *prophet* was one who declared the will of a higher power. In the early classical writers the words are commonly used in these senses. In the later language these meanings were considerably modified, especially in the New Testament writings. The Old Testament prophet, in his inspired utterances, was sometimes a stern rebuker of the sins of the nation and of its rulers, sometimes the herald of "a good time coming" (see Ezek. xxxvii.). The prophesying of Zacharias, like that spoken of in the Pauline epistles (see especially 1 Cor. xii.-xiv.), is chiefly distinguished from common speech by its ecstatic tone.

<sup>1</sup> The restriction of the English word "prophesy" to the foretelling of the future is of recent date. In the colonial days of New England to prophesy was only to speak upon some lofty theme, and every preacher was a prophet. This is well illustrated in the following passage from Felt's *Eccl. Hist. of New England*, i., 162:

"The Plymouth church and their guests, as the highest expression of their fellowship, partake of the sacrament. 'In the afternoon Mr. Roger Williams, according to their custom, proposed a question, to which the pastor, Mr. Smith, spake briefly; then Mr. Williams prophesied, and after the governor of Plymouth spake to the question; after him the elder; then some two or three more of the congregation; then the elder (according to Acts xiii., 14, 15) desired the governor of Massachusetts and Mr. Wilson [visitors] to speak to it, which they did.'"

If it is intended in this passage to make any distinction between "prophesying" and "speaking," which is very doubtful, the difference cannot be so great as to suggest that Mr. Williams, under the influence of a special inspiration from above, foretold something which was yet to come to pass.

\* *προφητεύω*.

† *προφήτης*.

§ 11. SECOND ACCOUNT OF THE BIRTH OF JESUS;  
ANGELIC ANNOUNCEMENT TO SHEPHERDS.

*Luke ii., 1-20.*

By the expression *in those days* reference is made quite indefinitely to the time of the events described in the preceding chapter. It is affirmed that about this time the Roman emperor by an official decree ordered a registration of the whole empire (*a*). Such registrations or enrolments, when made in the provinces, were not simply for the purpose of determining the number of the people, but were part of a system of taxation. Therefore, although the phrase <sup>1</sup> employed by Luke does not suggest a record of property as well as of persons, historical considerations partly justify the rendering of the Authorised Version, which reads "taxed" instead of *enrolled*.

There is some ambiguity in the wording of the parenthetical second verse, it being not altogether clear whether more than one enrolment by Quirinius is implied or whether Luke means to say that an enrolment was made in Palestine for the first time when Quirinius was governor. As a matter of fact, history knows of but one tax-census during the governorship of Quirinius. Since, according to Josephus, this one enrolment was made in A.D. 7, several years after the death of that Herod in whose reign Jesus is said to have been born (see Matt. ii., 1 ff. and cp. Luke i., 5), it is probable that there is confusion in Luke's chronology,—unless, indeed, which is altogether improbable, he was aware of a census concerning which all other writers are silent (*b*). When it is said (verse 3) that everybody went to *his own city* to enrol himself, some place near the residence of each one would naturally be understood, were it not for the statement immediately following, that Joseph went for his enrolment from Galilee

<sup>1</sup> ἀπογράφειν, *apographēsthai*.

where he lived to Bethlehem in Judæa, because he <sup>1</sup> was descended from King David, whose home had been in Bethlehem.<sup>2</sup> It is implied that it was necessary for Mary, his betrothed,<sup>3</sup> to accompany him and be enrolled in person; but the necessity for this does not appear from any knowledge which we have of the Roman manner of conducting such a census (*c*).

Since the season of pasturage in Judæa was between March and November, shepherds would not be watching their flocks by night (verse 8) at the time which the Christian world assigns for the birth of Jesus—December 25th. What the angel announces to the shepherds (verses 10, 11) is in perfect harmony with the promise made to Mary in i., 31-33: the birth of a child is proclaimed who, as God's anointed king, shall bring joy and safety to *all the people* of Israel. The legend is altogether Jewish and national, embracing no conception of the coming of a spiritual world-saviour. The poetical conception of a choir of angels, while adding much to the beauty of the legend, tends to confirm the impression made by previous portions of the Synoptic narrative, that we are not yet standing upon firm historical ground (*d*).

#### NOTES.

(*a*, p. 34) The common translation, *all the world*, is misleading. The Greek hardly admits of a literal rendering, but, as here used, its meaning would be conveyed with sufficient accuracy by the word "everybody." \* The Greeks first spoke

<sup>1</sup>The Sinaitic palimpsest reads "because they were both of the house of David."

<sup>2</sup>See 1 Sam. xvii., 12.

<sup>3</sup>According to the text of the Sinaitic palimpsest, and four manuscripts of the Itala, Mary was already his wife.

\* The Syriac Sinaitic palimpsest reads "all the land," which limits the enrolment to Syria. Although the Greek cannot be thus limited in its application, the Syriac reading does give colour to the conjecture of some of the commentators that this census was confined to Palestine.



of their land, in distinction from the lands occupied by those whom they termed barbarians, as *hē dikōumēnē*,\* “the inhabited (world),” the expression here used by Luke,—and when Rome became mistress of the larger part of the then known world she assumed to herself the title.

(*b*, p. 34.) Since Archelaus succeeded his father Herod the Great as ruler of Judæa in B.C. 4, it follows that Jesus was born at least four years and possibly five or six before the beginning of the Christian era.† When Archelaus was deposed by Roman authority in A.D. 6, Quirinius was appointed imperial legate. If he commenced his enrolment immediately upon his arrival in Judæa, Jesus would be at that time from ten to twelve years of age. Various attempts have been made to establish upon historical data the fact of an earlier census than the one mentioned by Josephus; but all such efforts have proved fruitless. But not only is all profane history silent with regard to such an enrolment, it is not credible that the Roman government should have attempted the taxation of the inhabitants of Palestine during the reign of one of the native kings. Until after the time of Archelaus Rome only exercised what at the present day would be called a “protectorate” over the domain of the Herods. This prerogative did not carry with it the right to tax the people thus recognised as friends and allies. Judæa at this time was no more subject to Rome than the Egypt of to-day is to England. Neither Quirinius nor any other Roman official could have instituted a census of Judæa with a view to the levying of taxes prior to its becoming a Roman province (A.D. 12), even though at times contributions of money had been demanded of Herod in consideration of his

\* *ἡ οἰκουμένη*. From this phrase we have the word “œcumenical,” as applied to councils embracing delegates from all parts of the world where the church has obtained a foothold.

† Reckoning from the supposed time of the birth of Christ was first introduced by Dionysius the Little in the early part of the sixth century. The inaccuracy of his computation makes necessary the paradoxical statement that Jesus was born from four to six years before Christ. The Dionysian calendar, although early introduced into southern Europe, does not appear in English history until the latter part of the seventh century, and not until eight centuries later had it come into general use throughout Christendom.

indebtedness to Roman power for the stability of his throne. No alternative then remains but to acknowledge the inaccuracy of Luke's account. Should it be thought that Luke's error may have been only in associating the enrolment in question with Quirinius, and that the general registry ordered by Augustus in B.C. 6 was the one which was in progress at the time of the birth of Jesus, it is to be remembered that all the enrolments made under this emperor, namely, in 26 and 6 B.C. and 14 A.D., were of Roman citizens only.

(*c*, p. 35) Several considerations tend to excite doubt as to the actual occurrence of this event. Then, as now in our own country, real estate was assessed where it was situated. So far from there being any intimation that either Joseph or Mary possessed such property in the village of Bethlehem, and so needed to go there on that account, quite another reason is given for their journey thither. If the levying of a poll-tax is to be thought of, then the registration would need to be made at the tax-office nearest the home of the individual—which in this case certainly would not have been Bethlehem. Supposing that under ordinary circumstances Mary would have been required to register in Bethlehem, the immediate prospect of becoming a mother would have been a sufficient reason for her not taking the journey at this precise time. Moreover, even if the difficulty of bringing the birth of Jesus into any near chronological relation with the enrolment of Quirinius could be overcome, (which could be done only by discrediting the statement of Matthew that Jesus was born "in the days of Herod the king,") there would remain the inconceivability that, after the deposition of Archelaus, when Judæa and Samaria were constituted a Roman province, a dweller in Galilee, which was not a part of this province, should be under the necessity of registering in the territory of a ruler to whom he owed no allegiance. A general consideration of some importance is this. The Roman authorities, aware of the existence of an intensely patriotic feeling among the great mass of the people of Palestine, carefully avoided unnecessary causes of irritation in their administration of the affairs of the province. Such an unnecessary annoyance a demand like that implied in Luke's account unquestionably would have been. If Joseph and Mary were under the necessity of taking a three-days' journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem in order to

register themselves in the little village where his ancestor David had been born a thousand years before, it can easily be conceived what a turmoil there would have been throughout the land when almost countless numbers were thus compelled to leave their homes and travel, many of them long distances, on an errand so distasteful. But that which would seem to have been both unnecessary and undesirable was also practically impossible; for, especially among the crowded population of Galilee, a large part of which was of mixed and uncertain race, few could have been able to determine the place of the original settlement of their tribe or their family. Even in Judæa and Samaria the difficulty would have been as real if not as great.

(*d*, p. 35) The historicity of the narrative depends not only upon its being a correct statement of the circumstances attending the birth of Jesus but also upon its being consistent with subsequent events. Since Jesus did not become king of Judæa, no divine messenger can have predicted that he would. The angelic annunciation is followed by none of the natural consequences of such a supernatural communication. The shepherds are said to have reported to others the strange story of the birth of the Messiah, but the Messianic drama ends with this first act. Even Mary only revolves *these things* in her mind, as though not understanding their full meaning, although they came as the fulfilment of the angelic prophecy that she should give birth to the Messiah. So when the Messianic prophecy is again repeated by Simeon (see the next section), both Joseph and Mary, notwithstanding all that has been said to have preceded, wonder (verse 33) at the prediction that their son is to be the glory of Israel. Again, when, more than thirty years later, the Messiahship of Jesus is affirmed by one of his most intimate disciples who had been with him from the beginning of his public ministry (see Matt. xvi., 16), it is not on the strength of the birth-story of the Gospels.

In attempting to trace to their real source the scattered rays which seem to shine upon us from the cradle of Jesus, we meet at the outset with that form of the Messianic hope which looks first to the race of David and next to the place of his birth for the appearance of "the dayspring from on high" (Luke i., 78). When in early Jewish-Christian thought Jesus had come to be accepted as the promised

Messiah, it was a matter of importance to discover how the Galilean teacher fulfilled the conditions not only of Davidic descent but also of birth in Bethlehem. If Jesus was the Messiah, he must have been born in the city of David, although Galilee was well known to have been his home in later years. Matthew and Luke agree as to Bethlehem having been the place of his birth ; but while the former knows nothing of a residence in Galilee until the return from the sojourn in Egypt, and seems to consider Bethlehem the home of Joseph and Mary, Luke plainly makes the father and mother of Jesus to have belonged to Nazareth from the beginning. The agreement of the two writers as to the bare fact of the birth in Bethlehem is a matter of small importance, considering that both were reporting popular tradition, which upon this point admitted of no variation. Neither does the story of the Judæan birth receive any valuable support from uniform later tradition, of which the accounts of Matthew and Luke, for aught we know, may have been the chief if not the only source.

Tradition had two principal elements upon which to work and which there was an intellectual necessity for combining into one harmonious whole, the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem and his life at Nazareth. Only two conceivable ways were open, one, to make Joseph and Mary true Bethlehemites, who only took up their residence in Nazareth after the birth of their first child, and the other, to think of his Nazarene parents as making a visit to Bethlehem just before his birth. One outward historical fact, that of the Galilean home, and one long-cherished national belief, that the nation's deliverer must come from Bethlehem, thus combined, under the moulding influence of the creative fancy, to give us an early Christian poetry rivalling in beauty if not in richness the mythologies of India and Greece.\* "Christianity," writes Dr. Frederic Henry Hedge,† "like every other religion, has its mythology,—a mythology so intertwined with the veritable facts of its early history, so braided and welded

\* Since there was and still is near Nazareth a small village called Bethlehem, it is not impossible that Jesus was born in this hamlet and that this circumstance helped on the formation of the later legend, the two Bethlehems being confounded.

† *Ways of the Spirit*, 319.

with its first beginnings, that history and myth are not always distinguishable the one from the other. Every historic religion, that has won for itself a conspicuous place in the world's history, has evolved from a core of fact a nimbus of legendary matter which critics cannot always separate, and which the popular faith does not seek to separate, from the solid parts of the system." \*

## § 12. THE CIRCUMCISION ; THE PRESENTATION IN THE TEMPLE.

*Luke ii., 21-39.*

The parents of Jesus are represented as complying with all the requirements of the Mosaic law at the time of the birth of their son. First, by the fulfilment of the conditions detailed in Gen. xvii., the child himself is made as it were a party to the covenant which the Lord established with Abraham. Then, on her own part, the mother, in obedience to the law of Lev. xii., goes to the temple in Jerusalem forty days after the birth, and out of her scanty means offers the sacrifice appointed for the poor.<sup>1</sup> The actual poverty of the parents of Jesus can hardly be considered as well established on the strength of the meagre evidence furnished by this passage so closely connected with material of doubtful historical value. The transition in this section from poetry to history is not clearly defined. Following the mythical birth-stories we have that which may be in part historical but

\* Although the words "myth" and "legend" are often used interchangeably, they are not exact synonyms. A legend, as distinguished from a myth, is an unhistorical narrative evolved from an historical fact, while a genuine myth is a purely ideal creation. Few writers, however, are careful to observe this distinction. A myth may be either the poetical embodiment of an idea or the product of the fancy working upon an historical model and creating an unreal historical parallel.

<sup>1</sup> Lev. xii., 8: "If her means suffice not for a lamb, then she shall take two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons."

which can hardly be looked upon as free from legendary additions (*a*). The language ascribed to Simeon, as well as that descriptive of the man, abounds in distinctively Jewish forms of thought and expression, although the latter are not unmingled with phrases which are classical as well as Biblical.<sup>1</sup> Thus a Greek might have been called, in the language of Plato as well as of the Bible, "righteous and devout," but only a Jew would look for "the consolation of Israel" and the coming of "the Lord's Christ" and "the redemption of Jerusalem." The evangelist was here, as in what has gone before, evidently drawing upon material derived, though probably indirectly, from Jewish sources.

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 41) The spirit of Messianic prophecy still pervades the narrative and gives to it in its details an air of unreality. Simeon and Anna may be real characters and not, as some have supposed, mere representative types of those who longingly waited for the coming of the Messiah, and they may have been present in the temple and congratulated Joseph and Mary upon the birth of a son who, they hoped, might prove to be the promised national deliverer; but it must be to the later Christian belief in the Messiahship of Jesus and to a knowledge of his actual career that we owe the exact form in which the narrative has come down to us. The 34th and 35th verses, addressed by Simeon to Mary, especially indicate an acquaintance with the history of Jesus,—with the manner in which he was received by his countrymen, accepted by some and rejected by others,—and with his tragic

<sup>1</sup> The Greek of the N. T. is the common spoken Greek of the writers' time, modified by an acquaintance with the language of the Septuagint. H. A. A. Kennedy has shown, in his *Sources of New Testament Greek*, that of the 4829 words of the N. T. about eighty per cent. were in use at least as early as the time of Aristotle. Of the remaining twenty per cent. one-third, or about seven per cent. of the whole number of words, are found in the Septuagint, and the rest in Plutarch, Polybius, and Philo. The direct dependence of the N. T. writers upon the LXX. has hitherto been much overrated.

death. That all this should have been foreseen by Simeon is not only incredible in itself, but its expression harmonises ill with the jubilant strains of verses 29-32.

### § 13. THE BOY JESUS WITH THE JEWISH DOCTORS.

*Luke ii., 40-52.*

Of the three great national festivals of the Jewish people the passover was the most important, celebrating, as it did, their deliverance from Egyptian slavery.<sup>1</sup> With it was connected the feast of unleavened bread, perhaps a Canaanitish festival adopted by the Israelites from the conquered people.<sup>2</sup> Since, after visiting the temple, each little group of relatives or friends, being assembled for the customary social meal, partook together of their paschal lamb, which had been butchered for them by a priest in the court of the temple, the passover supper came to be the most important part of the festival, so that it was not unnatural to speak of eating rather than of keeping or celebrating the passover.<sup>3</sup>

Since those living at long distances from Jerusalem were not required by law to attend the passover feast every year, that the parents of Jesus did so is some indication that their piety was of an especially earnest type.<sup>4</sup> Among the Jews

<sup>1</sup> Deut. xvi., 1: "Observe the month of Abib, and keep the passover unto the Lord thy God: for in the month of Abib the Lord thy God brought thee forth out of Egypt by night."

<sup>2</sup> See Ex. xiii., 3, 4, xxxiv., 18. In verse 41 two uncials (one of them the codex Bezae), three MSS. of the Itala, and the Sinaitic palimpsest, have the reading "the feast of unleavened bread of the passover."

<sup>3</sup> Luke xxii., 15: "With desire [*i. e.*, earnestly] I have desired to eat this passover with you."

<sup>4</sup> In verse 42, instead of the not very clear expression *after the custom of the feast*, the Arabic Diatessaron of Tatian has "after their custom to the feast," and the Sinaitic palimpsest "as was their wont to the feast."

religious training commenced at a very early age.<sup>1</sup> Certain religious obligations were imposed even upon children, and all the commandments of the law became binding upon one as soon as he arrived at the age of puberty.<sup>2</sup> We may reasonably infer from Jesus being taken to the feast by his parents upon the occasion here mentioned that he was now looked upon by them as no longer a mere child, although parental anxiety still continued to watch over him. That he should be able at the age of twelve to converse with the doctors of the law and that his questions should be welcomed and answered by them<sup>3</sup> is nothing strange; for Josephus says of himself,<sup>4</sup> "When I was still a child, about fourteen years of age, I was praised by all on account of my love of learning, the chief priests and the leading men of the city constantly coming together in order to get from me more accurate information concerning points of law"; and there is even a tradition that once a young man of sixteen was made president of a law-court.<sup>5</sup> Three times a day—morning, noon, and night—the child of Jewish parents was required to repeat the *Shemoneh Esreh* or chief prayer, a formula of petition, thanksgiving, and praise, which, as preserved to us in the modern Jewish prayer-book, is of the extent of more than a thousand words. Add to the religious influences of the home the instructions of the village rabbi and attendance

<sup>1</sup> Timothy is said "from a babe" to have "known the sacred scriptures."—2 Tim. iii., 15.

<sup>2</sup> According to the English civil law fourteen is the age of puberty for boys; but Orientals mature early, and Jewish manhood appears to have dated from the age of twelve or thirteen years.

<sup>3</sup> The rabbis even at their formal sessions allowed themselves to be questioned concerning points of difficulty by anyone present.

<sup>4</sup> *Life*, § 2.

<sup>5</sup> Both Josephus (*Ant.*, iv., 8, 12; *Against Apion*, i., 12, ii., 18, 26) and Philo (*Legation to Caius*, § 31) bear ample testimony to the pains taken with the instruction of youth among the Jews of their time.



upon the stated synagogue <sup>1</sup> service, and we can understand how it was that, in his youth, the son of Joseph and Mary became imbued with the spirit and acquainted with much of the letter of the Mosaic law, even before its serious study became obligatory upon him. That the impression made by this early training was deep and lasting appears from his answer to the question of his mother when he was found in the temple,<sup>2</sup> where alone, as it seemed to him, could it be supposed that he would be (*a*).

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 44) Although the occurrence of this incident in the boyhood of Jesus is certified to only by Luke, there is an air of verisimilitude about the story which partly compensates for the lack of full historical evidence. If, on the one hand, we might at first be inclined to suspect that admiration for the man had led to a belief in the remarkable early development of the child, so that the present narrative is probably to be ascribed to this source rather than to any recollection of actual facts by his parents or friends, on the other hand we have such adequate testimony to the not infrequent occurrence of what seems to us like very remarkable precocity among Jewish youths that the silence of Matthew and Mark here counts for little. There is nothing incredible in the statement that the parents of Jesus did not at first miss him from the homeward-bound caravan; for they might well suppose that he was somewhere in the company with friends. Since, according to custom, the caravan would be made up at most of representatives of only two or three neighbouring villages, and may even have been composed only of residents of Nazareth, Joseph and Mary would have no real cause for anxiety until the time of the evening encampment and the coming on of night.

<sup>1</sup> Even the little village of Nazareth had its synagogue. See Luke iv., 16.

<sup>2</sup> Of the two renderings, "in my Father's house" and "about my Father's business," the former has the support of Tatian's Diatessaron and the Curetonian Syriac and Armenian versions, while the Sinaitic palimpsest has the substantially equivalent but less definite expression "with my Father."

## § 14. JOHN THE BAPTIST AND HIS MINISTRY.

*Matt. iii., 1-12; Mark i., 1-8; Luke iii., 1-18.*

At this point the narrative assumes for the first time a distinctly historical character and a form truly synoptic. Although Matthew, Mark, and Luke occupy the same point of view and have a large part of their material in common, it is only the first and the third who, in this section, stand in any intimate relation to each other. In so far as these two have common matter, the order of recital is precisely the same; but Mark has a different arrangement. In Mark's much briefer narrative, however, there are but a very few words, and those quoted, which are not found in the accounts of Matthew and Luke (*a*). Mark's introduction presents a striking contrast to those of Matthew and Luke. He says not a word concerning the birth and childhood of John and Jesus, but opens his record with a brief account of the public ministry of the former. For him the *gospel of Jesus Christ* has no earlier beginning.

As in the earlier portions of both his first and second chapters, Luke here gives evidence of his possessing the true historical spirit. He endeavours to fix at the outset with great precision the time of the beginning of the public career of John the Baptist. The date of no other event recorded in the New Testament is given with so great precision. The author is not satisfied with merely mentioning the year of John's public appearing, but, by adding other data, he brings this event into close relation to the political and religious history of the time. Assuming that the first year of the Christian calendar is the year 753 of the Roman era, *the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius* corresponds to A.D. 29; or, to be more precise, since the exact date of the death of Augustus and the commencement of the reign of his step-son was August 19th of the year 14, the fifteenth year of the

reign of Tiberius may be counted as beginning with the 19th of August, A.D. 28. Pontius Pilate was imperial governor or procurator of the Roman province of Judæa during the last ten years of the reign of Tiberius, or from 26 to 36. The Herod here spoken of as *tetrarch*<sup>1</sup> of Galilee was Herod Antipas. No other Herod ever occupied this position. His reign lasted from B.C. 4 to A.D. 39. Philip was only half-brother of Herod Antipas, his mother being Cleopatra of Jerusalem, while Antipas was the son of Malthace the Samaritan, another of the nine wives of Herod the Great who were living at one time.<sup>2</sup> Philip was tetrarch from B.C. 4 until his death toward the end of A.D. 33 or the beginning of A.D. 34.<sup>3</sup> If Luke is correct in placing Abilene at this time under a tetrarch of the name of Lysanias, he supplies a fact not elsewhere attested except by a vague reference in Josephus<sup>4</sup> and one or two uncertain inscriptions. The high-priest Annas (= Hannas = Ananos) was appointed by Quirinius in A.D. 6 and retained his office until the year A.D. 15, when he was deposed by the procurator Valerius Gratus. During the eleven years of his administration Gratus made five appointments to the high-priesthood, the last being that of the Joseph who is called in the New Testament Caiaphas<sup>5</sup> (*b*).

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Matt. xiv., 1; Luke iii., 19. In Matt. xiv., 9, and Mark vi., 14, 22, the more general title of *king* is rather inexactly applied to him; but Josephus (*Wars of the Jews*, ii., 11, 5, and 12, 8) is equally inexact in speaking of the tetrarchy of Lysanias as a *kingdom* (βασιλεία) and of Lysanias as king (i., 22, 3).

<sup>2</sup> See Josephus, *Ant.*, xvii., 1, 3, and *Wars*, xxviii., 4.

<sup>3</sup> On these two members of the Herod family, see Appendix C.

<sup>4</sup> *Ant.*, xx., 7, 1. If the Lysanias mentioned in *Ant.*, xv., 4, 1, as having been put to death by Antony between B.C. 40 and 36, was tetrarch of Abilene and the only one of the name, then Luke's chronology is much at fault. See Schürer, Appendix i., 2; Holtzmann, *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.*, i., 57, 58; Meyer-Weiss, *Kommentar über das N. T.*, i., 347-348.

<sup>5</sup> Josephus, *Ant.*, xviii., 2, 1, 2, and 4, 3; xx., 9, 1; *Wars*, v., 12, 2.

At the time thus clearly defined by Luke, John is said to have appeared, like the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah, with an inspired message for his countrymen. Between this opening of the Third Gospel and the beginning of the Old Testament book of Jeremiah there is a very striking resemblance not only in thought and general literary form but even in language. Luke's announcement of John's prophetic word is expressed in phraseology, borrowed from the LXX., almost identical with that with which Jeremiah introduces his message. In place of Luke's definite historical statement Matthew has the very general expression *in those days*, by which he refers vaguely to the period in which the events previously spoken of took place. For him the beginnings of Christianity are foreshortened as it were, the birth and first public appearing of John and Jesus constituting but a single epoch. Such lack of chronological perspective is characteristic of early Jewish literature.<sup>1</sup> Each of the synoptists, but not the writer of the Fourth Gospel, speaks of John as *hō baptistēs*,<sup>2</sup> "the baptiser," whence the surname of *the Baptist*. Elsewhere, of early writers, only Josephus<sup>3</sup> gives him this title. Baptism was known before the time of John, but the special importance which he attached to the rite made him preëminently *the baptiser* (*c*). The significance of John's baptism is most fully set forth by Josephus in the passage already referred to: "For Herod put him [John] to death—a good man, who exhorted the Jews that, living virtuously both by acting justly toward one another and by honouring the Deity, they should present themselves for baptism; for that thus even the act of baptism<sup>4</sup> would appear acceptable to Him, if they used it not for the sake of procuring forgive-

<sup>1</sup> It is, therefore, not necessary to suppose a reference to other nearer events described in some document from which the evangelist borrowed.

<sup>2</sup> ὁ βαπτιστής.

<sup>3</sup> *Ant.*, xviii., 5, 2.

<sup>4</sup> βάπτισις, *baptisis*.

ness of certain offences, but for the purification of the body, inasmuch as the soul had been previously purified through righteousness." Stated concisely, John's baptism, according to Josephus, was for the purification of the body of one whose soul was already pure. The evangelists, on the other hand, agree in representing the matter somewhat differently, making the confession of sinfulness, but with an implied promise of reform, to have been a prerequisite for baptism. It is evident that nothing more than this could have been demanded of multitudes of men for the most part personally unknown to the Baptist. What he desired was to help them to begin a better life, and to this end he asked them to submit themselves to the symbolic rite of purification by water.

Mark, with a conciseness of expression natural to one who, making use of a familiar phrase, sees no reason for explaining its meaning, mentions only *the wilderness* as the place of John's ministry. Bringing together the more precise statements of Matthew and Luke, we are able to locate the field of his activity in the thinly inhabited district of Judæa lying along the banks of the Jordan not far from where it enters the Dead Sea. This part of Palestine must have been then substantially what it is to-day, not a "desert," in the sense of being incapable of supporting animal and vegetable life, but a tract of barren land comparatively unfruitful. Into this wild region John came, not *preaching*, in the modern sense of the term, but "making proclamation,"<sup>1</sup> as a herald,<sup>2</sup> of the near approach of *the kingdom of heaven* (*d*). Mark and Luke, using identical language, speak of John as proclaiming *a baptism of* [*i. e.*, conjoined with] *repentance unto* [*i. e.*, looking to] *remission of sins*. "Remission of sins" is here, as in Luke i., 77, the abolition of their penalty. By condensing the message of John into the imperative *Repent!* Matthew secures a dramatic effect

<sup>1</sup> κηρύσσων, *kērussōn*.

<sup>2</sup> κήρυξ, *kērux*.

not attained by Mark and Luke (*e*). The words introduced by Matthew from Is. xl. are found also in Mark and Luke ; but Luke quotes at much greater length, and to Mark's citation a passage from the beginning of Mal. iii. is prefixed without any intimation that it is from a different source.<sup>1</sup> The Fourth Gospel (i., 23) has the same citation but in a condensed form (*f*). The passage in Isaiah has reference to the return of the captive Jews from Babylon and to that only. Jehovah is poetically represented as about to rescue and lead home His chosen people. Before Him goes a herald to announce His coming and to secure the removal of all obstacles to His progress. This deliverance of Israel from the hand of the oppressor is the underlying note and not infrequently the direct theme of a considerable part of ch. xl.-xlviii. In xlv., 28, and xlv., 1, Cyrus is pointed out as Jehovah's instrument for this deliverance. When the Christian church came to conceive of the work of John as preparatory to that of Jesus, it was quite in accordance with the customary use of the Old Testament Scriptures to apply this passage to the Baptist. Mark deals in the same free manner with the words in which Malachi represents Jehovah as declaring that He is about to come and cleanse His temple which has been profaned by the irreligiousness and immorality of the priests. The *messenger* who is sent to prepare the way is the prophet himself, "Malachi" meaning "my messenger."<sup>2</sup> Taking

<sup>1</sup> The various reading *in the prophets* (see R. V., margin) is doubtless the result of an attempt to get rid of a difficulty. The quotations all depart from the Hebrew in several places, but agree substantially with the LXX. In all there is a substitution of "His paths" for "the paths of our God"—a remarkable agreement indicating either dependence upon a common source or of the later evangelists upon the earlier. In Luke the Sinaitic palimpsest has substantially the original form of the passage : in Matthew its quotation is limited to "Prepare ye a way for the Lord."

<sup>2</sup> So in Hag. i., 13, the prophet says, "Thus spake Haggai the Lord's messenger (*malach*)."

the passage by itself and disregarding its original connection the evangelist makes what verbal changes are necessary in order to adapt it to his purpose. The personal appearance and mode of life of the Baptist are briefly but graphically described by Matthew and Mark. Matthew's *himself* recalls our thought from the messenger of prophecy to the one who actually came as the herald of the Messiah. Like his prototype Elijah, of whom 2 Kings i., 8, says, "He was an hairy man [*i. e.*, probably, clad in hairy clothing] and girt with a girdle of leather about his loins," John appears clothed in the poorest and simplest raiment. From Is. xx., 2, and Zech. xiii., 4, it may be inferred that this was the common garb of prophets as well as of the poor.<sup>1</sup> The Mosaic law, while prohibiting the eating of "winged creeping things" in general, made an exception in the case of the locust family.<sup>2</sup> The wild honey<sup>3</sup> which made a part of the Baptist's food may have been either an animal or a vegetable product. Matthew and Mark furnish a good example of the exaggeration of popular speech, when they represent

<sup>1</sup> The hair of camels and goats is still used to some extent in the East for the manufacture of inexpensive clothing.

<sup>2</sup> See Lev. xi., 20-23. Locusts were eaten by the Greeks and Romans as well as by the Jews. Aristotle says that female locusts caught before the deposition of their eggs and fried in oil are "very sweet." These insects are still used for food in some countries. In the East they furnish material for bread and are also eaten roasted or boiled, after the wings have been removed. Some of the North American Indians stew them in milk or fry them in butter with crumbs, and some make bread of them. For further particulars see *Bible Animals*, by J. G. Wood, 596-604.

<sup>3</sup> Μέλι ἄγριον (*mèli agriōn*), "wild honey," was sometimes used to designate certain vegetable juices sweet to the taste, which distil from trees and thicken upon exposure to the air. In this sense it is equivalent to the English "honey-dew." That the honey of bees is not always indicated by μέλι appears from Herodotus, i., 193, where he speaks of μέλι being made from the fruit of the date-palm. The honey of wild bees is referred to in 1 Sam. xiv., 25-27.

the whole population not only of Jerusalem but of all Judæa as flocking to the Jordan to be baptised by John. Luke, more careful historian that he is, speaks only of *multitudes*.<sup>1</sup> By *all the region round about Jordan* is meant the country on both sides of the river.<sup>2</sup> This is the modern *El-Ghor* or "Long Valley." Mark limits himself to repeating of the Baptist's teaching only so much as has reference to his relation to the one of greater dignity<sup>3</sup> who is to come after him.<sup>4</sup> Notwithstanding the vagueness of his language, there can be no doubt that this *mightier* one is the expected Messiah. In order to present as strikingly as possible the difference between himself and the one who is to come after he compares his relation to him with that of the meanest slave to his master; for the care of the master's sandals was considered the most menial of offices. The baptism of the coming one is to be not with water but in a more subtle element, even the divine breath, the *pnēuma hagion*.<sup>5</sup> To this is added in Matthew and Luke a purification by fire, with reference to the searching character of the Messianic judgment. Matthew leads up to this with a passage (verse 10) which Luke also has (verse 9) but does not use in the same way, introducing the fiery baptism later (verse 16) and

<sup>1</sup> In the same sober vein Josephus speaks only of the gathering of a large crowd.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. "the plain [marg. trans. *circle*] of Jordan," Gen. xiii., 10. In Matt. the Sinaitic palimpsest reads "all from beyond the river Jordan." The Fourth Gospel (iii., 26, x., 40) places John beyond the Jordan. In Judæa he would not have been in the domain of Herod Antipas, by whom he was imprisoned and put to death.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. John iii., 30: "He [Jesus] must increase, but I [John] must decrease."

<sup>4</sup> Although Matthew and Mark substantially agree in this passage, the differences are such as to indicate that neither copied directly from the other. Luke agrees now with Mark and now with Matthew.

<sup>5</sup> By the translation *the Holy Ghost* not only is the true thought concealed, but the passage is rendered unintelligible.



with a different connection. It is indeed necessary to go farther back in order to understand this part of John's message. Those whom he addresses, whether *the multitudes*, as in Luke, or *the Pharisees and Sadducees*, as in Matthew, are called upon in language unsparing, if not violent, to repent of their sins (*g*). In asking them who had warned them to flee from the coming wrath he assumes that they are anticipating with fear the approach of the Messianic judgment.<sup>1</sup> If they think that by virtue of their being God's chosen people they will be received into the Messianic kingdom without question, he assures them that only through repentance and a new life ("fruit befitting repentance") can this felicity be attained. God would sooner create for Himself a new race of men from the very stones lying at their feet than to receive *them* in their present guilty state.<sup>2</sup> It was a favourite belief among the Jews that all the "children of Abraham" were heirs of the kingdom.<sup>3</sup> Resuming the figure of the fruit-bearing tree, John warns his hearers that the time is very near at hand when those not producing good fruit will be exposed to the consuming fire of God's wrath. Had not the prophet said of Jehovah,<sup>4</sup> "Behold, the Lord will come with fire, and his chariot shall be like the whirlwind; to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire. For by fire will the Lord plead, and by his sword, with all flesh." In Matthew's order, comes in, first, the figure of baptism in fire, and then the simile of the burning chaff, the latter symbolising the divine retribution upon evil-doers. Here only in the New Testament is the *fan*<sup>5</sup> or

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Rom. i., 18, ii., 5; 1 Thess. ii., 16.

<sup>2</sup> Few at the present day find any reference here to the rejection of the Jews and the acceptance of the Gentiles.

<sup>3</sup> In the Talmud there is ample evidence of this. Cp. also John viii., 33 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Is. lxvi., 15, 16. Cp. Heb. xii., 29, "Our God is a consuming fire."

<sup>5</sup> πρῶον, *pluōn*.

winnowing-shovel spoken of. With it the grain was thrown up into the air, that the chaff might thus be separated from the wheat. *Unquenchable fire* is fire which dies out only when there is nothing more left for it to consume.<sup>1</sup> Luke (verse 10) represents the multitudes as seriously inquiring what they shall do to escape the threatened doom. John's only requirement is love for one's neighbour, manifested by deeds of helpfulness. Food and clothing<sup>2</sup> are to be shared by those having an abundance with those who are in need. Luke singles out for special mention two classes of persons who would naturally seem to John as to every faithful Jew especially in need of repentance—"publicans"<sup>3</sup> and "soldiers." Luke alone indicates (verse 18) that what he has recorded is but a small part of John's proclamation of good news,—for that the Messiah was at last coming was indeed

<sup>1</sup> Verses 7-10 of Matt. and 7-9 of Luke are so nearly identical in language as to indicate a very near genetic relation between the two passages, while verses 11 and 12 of Matt. and 16 and 17 of Luke are more loosely connected. In the two sentences which Mark and Luke have in common they appear to be somewhat related.

<sup>2</sup> "Garments" is better than *coats* as a rendering of χιτῶνας. Since the χιτῶν (*chitōn*) was properly an undergarment, the word corresponds most nearly to the Latin "*tunica*" and the English "shirt." See Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, under "Tunica."

<sup>3</sup> τελωναί (*tēlōnai*), best rendered "tax-gatherers." Those properly called "publicans," *i. e.*, public officers (Latin *publicani*), were Roman citizens of rank who purchased of the government the right to collect the taxes of a province. The *telonai* of the N. T. were either subordinates of the *publicani*, or else, which is more probable, collectors appointed by the Roman officials in the province. These collectors were particularly odious to the stricter Jews, not merely on account of their frequent extortions but because they represented Roman rule, the legitimacy of which the subjects of Jehovah, the only true king, could not recognise. See Schürer, I., ii., 68 ff.; Carpenter's *Life in Palestine*, § 25; Edersheim's *Jesus the Messiah*, second ed., i., 515 ff.

“glad tidings” to those not liable to his condemnation. Luke also stands alone in mentioning in this immediate connection the apprehension of John.<sup>1</sup>

## NOTES.

(a, p. 45) It would seem that Luke here had access either to Matthew’s Gospel or to its sources, of which the Mark-Gospel, as already indicated, probably formed a part ; for the three accounts have too many forms of expression in common to allow us to think of them as altogether independent compositions.

(b, p. 46) Since there could be but one high-priest at a time, and Caiaphas, the son-in-law of Annas, held the office during the governorship of Pontius Pilate, Annas could have been called high-priest at this time only by courtesy. There are several instances on record in which the custom prevailed of continuing to apply the title of high-priest to one who had been superseded in office.\* In Acts iv., 6, Annas is again spoken of as the high-priest, and Caiaphas is referred to in such a way as to give the impression that he occupied a subordinate position. In John xviii., 13, 24, on the other hand, it is Caiaphas and not Annas who is high-priest† ; yet the fact that Jesus was first brought before Annas makes it clear that he was recognised as having no small degree of authority.

(c, p. 47) Some insist on “the immerser” as the only proper translation of *hō baptistēs*, claiming that the verb *baptizein* ‡ always signifies to plunge beneath the surface of the water. This theory is consistently applied in *The Common English Version* [of the New Testament] *Corrected by the Final Committee of the American Bible Union*, even to the extent of translating, in Mark vii., 4, “immersions of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and couches.” The most elaborate consideration of the subject from this point of view is to be found in T. J. Conant’s *The Meaning and Use of*

<sup>1</sup> See § 97.

\* See Schürer, II., i., 202–203.

† “Caiaphas, which was high-priest that year.” “Annas therefore sent him [Jesus] bound unto Caiaphas the high-priest.”

‡ βαπτίζειν.

*Baptizein Philologically and Historically Investigated.* (Am. Bible Union, 1861). Both the Greek *baptizein* and the English "immerse" suggest rather than express the idea of complete submergence. "Dip" is perhaps the nearest English equivalent of these two words. To claim that in John's baptism no part of the body was ever untouched by the water is to force upon the words of the evangelist a strictness of meaning inconsistent with their common use. Confirmatory of this view is the fact that the early Christians allowed an adaptation to circumstances in the administration of the rite of baptism quite inconsistent with the idea that complete immersion was considered a necessary form. Thus the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, a document probably as old as some portions of the New Testament, authorises baptism, in case of need, by pouring water upon the head.\*

(*d*, p. 48) Although Matthew alone of the New Testament writers uses this exact phrase, its substantial equivalents, "kingdom of God," "kingdom of Christ," "kingdom" (of God or of Christ being understood), are constantly recurring, especially in the Synoptics. Once, in 2 Tim. iv., 18, there is an approximation to Matthew's usage in the phrase "heavenly kingdom." The various meanings of the English word "heaven" are paralleled in the Biblical use of *ōuranōs*.† In Matthew's *kingdom of heaven* the place stands for him who is thought of as occupying it. All that is signified by God's "kingdom," or more strictly, according to modern usage, His "reign," cannot be brought under one formula, it being impossible to deduce a single uniform meaning from the about one hundred and fifty New Testament instances of the use of the phrase. John's understanding of it can hardly have been any other than that of the popular Messianic expectation, according to which the anointed national king was to be, as in times of old, the viceroy of Jehovah.‡ But whatever other elements might at

\* See ch. vii.

† *οὐρανός*.

‡ But see Drummond's *The Jewish Messiah*, 319. Josephus says nothing directly about the Messianic character of John's preaching, but, since he represents Herod as fearing lest the Baptist's influence over the people should not only put it into his power but arouse in him the inclination to stir up a revolution (*Ant.*, xviii., 5, 2), it is not unlikely that what especially excited the suspicions of the king was

any time enter into the conception of "the kingdom of heaven," a recognition of the *supremacy of righteousness* was always present and preëminent. Under the influence of monarchical ideas Jehovah could be thought of no otherwise than as the supreme King.

(e, p. 49) There is no better way of rendering *mětanōċin* and *mětanōċia* \* than by "repent" and "repentance." To substitute for "repentance" "change of mind," as some have done, is to place etymology before usage; and to make John issue a call to "reform" is to forget the cause in the presence of the effect. As early as the fifth century before Christ Antipho used the verb *mětanōċin* in the sense of "to repent," and in this sense the LXX. employed it two centuries later, as well as Josephus and Philo about the beginning of the Christian era. Regret for past wrong-doing is clearly the sense in which Josephus uses *mětanōċia* † in *Ant.*, xiii., 11, 3, where Aristobulus is represented as repenting of the murder of his brother. The repentance which John demanded was such sorrow for past sins as should give promise of amendment in the future.

(f, p. 49) The "squinting construction" of the unpointed text, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness make ye ready," which leaves it uncertain whether "in the wilderness" belongs to "crying" or to "make ready," ‡ does not appear in the Hebrew, which, as the poetic parallelism § plainly shows, intends the latter connection. In the Revised Version of Isaiah "crieth in the wilderness" is given in the margin as an allowable rendering; but this is probably a concession to the usual understanding of the New Testament form of the passage.

John's proclamation of a new "kingdom." The genuineness of this passage, however, is not beyond question. See Schürer, I., ii., 25.

\* *μετανοεῖν, μετάνοια.*

† Rendered by the Latin *pœnitentia* in Dindorf's edition.

‡ Editors and translators keep the difficulty out of sight by the use of punctuation and capital letters.

§ It is a characteristic of the poetic style in Hebrew literature to repeat substantially ideas in consecutive members of the same sentence, varying somewhat the form of expression. Occasional traces of this tendency have been observable in the poetical portions of previous sections.

(*g*, p. 52) The epithet *brood of vipers* appears elsewhere in the New Testament only in Matt. xii., 34, xxiii., 33, where it is applied by Jesus to the Pharisees. The viper (*ēchidna*), with its outer sleekness hiding its virulent nature, appears in Greek tragedy as a favourite emblem of treachery and falsehood. Jesus had had such experience of these qualities in those of the Pharisees who were insidiously plotting against him that his language cannot be said to have been without justification; but coming from John, and applied indiscriminately to all those who flocked to hear him, it seems altogether unprovoked. It is a question whether after many years those who recorded the sayings of John and of Jesus were able always to discriminate truthfully between them or to assign to them their right relations. If Jesus never had occasion to accuse the Sadducees and the Jewish people in general of hypocrisy, it may be questioned whether John is correctly reported as connecting with the Pharisees that sect whose members were seldom found in their company, as well as the great mass of the people not all of whom could be supposed to have Pharisaic sympathies.\*

## § 15. THE BAPTISM OF JESUS.

*Matt. iii., 13-17; Mark i., 9-11; Luke iii., 21-22.*

Matthew alone says that, when Jesus offered himself for baptism, John administered the rite somewhat unwillingly. Neither here nor in the preceding section is the Baptist represented as recognising the Messiahship of Jesus<sup>1</sup> (*a*): his unwillingness to baptise him appears to spring from a conviction of his own moral inferiority. He yields to the request of Jesus only upon his urging<sup>2</sup> that to make an ex-

\* On the Pharisees and Sadducees, see Appendix D.

<sup>1</sup> The writer of the late Fourth Gospel, on the other hand, in i., 34, puts into the mouth of John these words: "I have seen and borne witness that this [Jesus] is the Son of God."

<sup>2</sup> In *suffer it now* there may be a hint of a time when their relations to each other will be changed; but it is hardly safe to draw such an inference from the supposed meaning of a single word (*ἄρτι*), which may not accurately represent the Aramaic phrase used by Jesus. It is, in fact, conceivable that these words are only an echo of the Messianic faith of the early church.

ception in his case would not be a fitting thing—would be not to do all that is required by the moral law. Jesus not only makes no claim to exemption from this symbolic rite of purification but insists upon his obligation to submit himself to it. In the phrase “kingdom of heaven” the word “heaven,” *δουρανός*, as we have seen,<sup>1</sup> has little of local suggestion; but here it distinctly indicates the apparent vault of the sky, which the ancients supposed to be a solid arch resting upon the plane of the earth.<sup>2</sup> In the popular belief of the Jews the Deity was conceived as having a special abode above this heaven of the sun, moon, and stars,<sup>3</sup> just as among the Greeks Zeus was supposed to dwell above the clouds. When it is said that the heavens were *opened* or *rent asunder* as Jesus came up out of the water after his baptism, there is nothing in the account which would suggest to us that it was intended to describe anything but a physical event, were it not that we have in Mark’s statement what is not unlikely a survival of the earliest form of the tradition—an implied limitation of the vision of the opening heavens to Jesus only, which may indicate a purely subjective

<sup>1</sup> Matt. iii., 2, in § 14.

<sup>2</sup> This idea is embodied in the English word “firmament” (from *firmamentum* of the Latin Vulgate), and the Greek *στρεπνώμα* of the LXX. See Gen. i., 6-8, and cp. Ezek. i., 22-26; Eccclus. xliii., 1. *Shamayim*, the Hebrew word for the heavens, means etymologically the *heights* or *upper regions*.

<sup>3</sup> Like many of the nations of antiquity the Jews believed in a plurality of local heavens, seven being the generally accepted number, and no rabbi teaching that there were fewer than two. The modern Christian conception of heaven as the present dwelling-place of departed spirits as well as of the Deity, is not derived from the Scriptures, which, so far from peopling the heavenly abodes with those who have first lived righteously upon earth, admit to the society of God and His angels only Enoch and Elijah, transported to heaven without dying, and Jesus, “the first-fruits of them that are asleep” (1 Cor. xv., 20, 23).

phenomenon <sup>1</sup> (b). It would be consistent with Mark's representation to suppose that he conceived of the divine voice as heard by Jesus and no one else and so being really an inward voice.<sup>2</sup> In reporting the words said to have been uttered Luke follows Mark without variation, while Matthew has a form which is a testimony about Jesus rather than an address to him. The purport of the words is that Jesus is the Messiah, God's beloved Son.<sup>3</sup>

## NOTES.

(a, p. 57) Even after John's death his disciples, instead of becoming followers of Jesus, as they naturally would have done if they had been taught to look upon him as the Messiah, remained, for the most part, outside of the Christian communion. For the place of honour held by John both in the Gospels and in the Christian church he is largely indebted to the unwarrantable supposition that he knew and proclaimed Jesus to be the Messiah for whose coming he was preparing the way. Even after Jesus had become famous, John, then only beginning to suspect that he might be the Messiah, sent messengers to ask him whether this was the fact.\*

(b, p. 59) A marked tendency toward progressive amplifi-

<sup>1</sup>The phrase rendered *unto him* in the A. V. and R. V. of Matthew (verse 16) is rejected by some of the best editors. If retained it only confirms the statement of the next clause. No other experience of such subjective vision is ascribed to Jesus in the N. T.

<sup>2</sup>The later Jews had a term, *bath kol*, or "daughter-voice," which, as Maimonides in a rationalising spirit explains, is "when a man has such a strong imagination that he believes he hears a voice from without him." One of the Talmudists speaks of a *bath kol* as, upon a certain occasion, cooing like a dove. Between this notion and the earlier idea of audible messages from heaven there appears to be a close relation.

<sup>3</sup>It is not consistent with Matthew's making John hear the proclamation of the Messiahship of Jesus that he afterwards represents him as uncertain on this point.

\* See Matt. xi., 2, 3; Luke vii., 18, 19.



cation appears in the successive accounts of that which is associated with the opening of the heavens—the descent of the Divine Spirit in the form of a dove. While Matthew and Mark declare only that Jesus saw the dovelike form, Luke speaks of the appearance as though it were what anyone might have seen, and the Fourth Gospel (i., 33, 34) makes the Baptist declare that he did see it. Luke again is more specific than Matthew and Mark in declaring that the Spirit *descended in bodily form like a dove* (in Tatian's Diatessaron, "in the form of a dove's body," in the Sinaitic palimpsest, "in the likeness of the body of a dove"), an indication that the legend had now reached in his circle a stage of development in which there was no longer any doubt as to the objectivity of the vision.\*

### § 16. THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS.

*Matt. iv., 1-11; Mark i., 12, 13; Luke iv., 1-13.*

Assuming the priority of Mark's Gospel, his brief narrative contains the nucleus of the story of the temptation, of which the much more extended accounts of Matthew and Luke are a later development. Noticing first only the elements of this primitive tradition, we find them to be four in number: (1) that Divine Spirit which had manifested itself to Jesus at the baptism urges him immediately after into the wilderness; (2) he remains there forty days tempted by Satan; (3) he is in the midst of wild beasts; (4) during this time angels

\* Philo says that "the divine wisdom" is symbolically called a turtle-dove (*τρογών*). Some of the Talmudists liken the spirit of God which "moved upon [or was brooding upon] the face of the waters" (Gen. i., 2) at the creation to a brooding dove. Even the voice of the turtle-dove heard in the spring season (S. of Sol. ii., 12) was interpreted in the post-Talmudic times as being the voice of the Divine Spirit. The dove which went out from Noah's ark and did not return was declared by one of the rabbis to have been the spirit of God, which, at the coming of the Messiah, will bring a crown in its mouth and place it upon the head of the anointed one, at the same time touching him and not touching him.

minister to him. At the baptism Jesus had been visited by the Holy Spirit, bringing assurance of the divine favour ; in the wilderness he contends with and vanquishes the embodied spirit of evil. This second theme the later Synoptics develop, either out of current tradition or by the free workings of fancy, into a sort of sacred drama or miracle-play. They use the pictorial elements furnished by Mark, with the exception of the third, which represents his simple realistic effort to intensify the horrors of the wilderness.<sup>1</sup> Luke follows Mark in stating merely the *fact* of the temptation, while Matthew's Hebraistic form of expression *to be tempted* indicates that it was a part of the divine purpose in bringing Jesus into the wilderness that his moral strength should there be tested.<sup>2</sup> Instead of Mark's *Satan*, Matthew and Luke have *the devil*,<sup>3</sup> Matthew also using as a synonyme *the tempter*.<sup>4</sup> "Satan" is a Hebrew common noun, meaning an "adversary,"<sup>5</sup> transformed into a proper name by the prefixing of the definite article, and used to designate the chief of the evil spirits (*a*). In the pictorially developed account of Matthew, Jesus is said to have *fasted* during the forty days spent in the wilderness (*b*). By itself this might indicate only that he subsisted upon the scanty food which nature unaided by man furnished him ; but, calling to mind the experiences of Moses<sup>6</sup> and Elijah,<sup>7</sup> it seems probable that

<sup>1</sup> Cp. 2 Mac. v., 27 : "But Judas Maccabæus with nine others, or thereabout, withdrew into the wilderness and lived in the mountains after the manner of wild beasts, with his company, and they fed on herbs continually."

<sup>2</sup> πειρασθῆναι, "be put to the test," rather than "tempted." In the Sinaitic palimpsest Luke also has the telic form, "that he might be tempted."

<sup>3</sup> ὁ διάβολος, ἡ δὲ διαβόλος. So the LXX. in Job i., 6, *et al.*

<sup>4</sup> Found elsewhere in the N. T. only in 1 Thess. iii., 5.

<sup>5</sup> See Ps. cix., 6, margin.

<sup>6</sup> Deut. ix., 9 ; Ex. xxxiv., 28.

<sup>7</sup> 1 Kings xix., 8.

the fasting was intended to be represented as absolute. Luke's statement that *he did eat nothing in those days* seems to imply complete abstinence from food ; but other passages show that not to eat bread and drink wine, that is, not to partake of customary food and drink, might be spoken of as "eating nothing."<sup>1</sup> The mention of the fact that Jesus after his extended fast (forty days is only a common expression for "a long time") experienced the pangs of hunger serves as a natural introduction to the first temptation. Satan suggests that Jesus, since he is the Messiah, shall use his God-given powers for transforming the loaf-shaped stones lying at his feet into bread. The words of the reply to the tempter are borrowed from the Scriptures<sup>2</sup> and are given by the evangelists in almost the identical language of the LXX.<sup>3</sup> Though originally spoken with reference to the manna providentially furnished to the fugitive children of Israel in the desert, they seem not unsuited to the present occasion, teaching, as they do, the general lesson of dependence upon the divine bounty. According to the order of Matthew, as a second trial Jesus is transported from the wilderness to Jerusalem and placed upon some lofty part of the temple, with the suggestion that he shall throw himself down and trust to God's fatherly protection to save him from harm. Matthew does not, like the more cosmopolitan Luke, use the name *Jerusalem*, but speaks of *the holy city*,<sup>4</sup> as a Jew would naturally do in writing for Jews. Jesus having replied to the previous temptation with a citation from the Scriptures, Satan strives to protect himself in advance from another answer of this sort by supporting his second suggestion with a quotation from the same source, though from the Psalter<sup>5</sup> and not from a book of the Law. The whole

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Matt. xi., 18 with Luke vii., 33.

<sup>2</sup> Deut. viii., 3.

<sup>3</sup> In the phrase "*it is written*" reference is always made to the O. T.

<sup>4</sup> Matthew again employs this phrase in xxvii., 53.

<sup>5</sup> Ps. xci., 11, 12.

psalm from which the passage is taken encourages reliance upon the divine protection ; but Satan perverts its spirit by citing it in justification of an unnecessary and boastful display of trust in God. In both Matthew and Luke the language is almost identical with that of the LXX. Jesus replies to the tempter with an apt counter-quotation made from the same source as before.<sup>1</sup> But Satan will not readily yield. Again, making a last supreme effort and wielding the keenest weapon in his armoury, he strives to arouse in Jesus a spirit of ambition and self-seeking, promising him world-wide dominion if he will only prostrate himself in homage before him. Matthew's narrative is here more picturesque than that of Luke, since he takes us in imagination to the summit of some lofty mountain having an outlook limited only by the circumference of the earth's disk. The tempter receives his final check in words a third time taken from the Mosaic Law,<sup>2</sup> in which supreme homage is claimed for Jehovah. The Septuagint in the Alexandrian text is quoted with exactness. The passage in its original connection is a protest against the worship of other deities than Jehovah. Satan, in assuming that this is his and not God's world, places himself among the "other gods" against whose service the people of Israel were warned (c).

## NOTES.

(a, p. 61) The verbal root from which the noun "Satan" is derived signifies first "to set a trap," and then to "lie in wait," as a cunning adversary. But Satan is not only an adversary : he is also represented in the Scriptures as an accuser and calumniator, and it is in this sense that he is called in Greek *hō diabolōs*, "the slanderer."\* In the Apocalypse (xii., 9, 10) he is "the great dragon," "the old serpent, he

<sup>1</sup> Deut. vi., 16. Cp. Ex. xvii., 1-7.

<sup>2</sup> Deut. vi., 13.

\* In the LXX. of Esther viii., 1, Haman, the enemy of the Jews, is called their *diabolos*.

that is called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world," "the accuser of our brethren which accuseth them before our God day and night." In the Old Testament Satan appears as less virulent, and in the Book of Job (ch. i., ii.) is hardly more than a powerful cynical spirit who doubts the unselfishness of human virtue. The vagueness of the Hebrew conception of Satan is well shown in two parallel passages, 1 Chron. xxi., 1, and 2 Sam. xxiv., 1, what Satan does according to the former being attributed to God in the latter.\*

(b, p. 61) Mark makes no mention of the fasting of Jesus. When he says that *angels ministered unto him*, a very common sense of the Greek word rendered "ministered" warrants us in understanding the evangelist to mean that angels supplied him with food. (See, in the LXX., Ps. lxxvii., 25, "men ate angels' food"; Wisd. xvi., 20, "thou didst feed thy people with angels' food.") It would seem that, when Mark's simple tradition that Jesus was tempted by the devil was augmented by the details now found in the other Synoptics, the ministry of angels was thereby thrust forward to the end of the narrative, where it stands in the account of Matthew.

(c, p. 63) The historical basis of the account of the temptation of Jesus is variously supplied by Biblical scholars. Omitting the altogether uncritical hypothesis that everything transpired precisely as related by the evangelists, the various current theories may be ranged under two heads, according as they do or do not assume the actual existence of a personal devil. (1) There was a real temptation by a real devil; but, instead of appearing in bodily form, he merely presented to the mind of Jesus inducements to wrong-doing. (2a) The story is only a scenic presentation either of special temptations or of classes of temptations arising naturally in his own mind as he deliberated upon what should be his lifework; or it was simply a moral lesson expressed by him in figurative language for the instruction of his disciples as to their own proper conduct, or as to the conduct which they were to expect from him. This last form of the second theory might receive illustration from the reply of Jesus to Peter when the too forward disciple protested against the self-sacrifice of his master: † "Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art a stum-

\* Cp. Zech. iii., 1, 2.

† Matt. xvi., 23. Cp. Mark viii., 33.

bling-block \* unto me : for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men." (2*b*) The whole story is mythical.

## § 17. THE RETURN OF JESUS TO GALILEE AND HIS PREACHING THERE.

*Matt. iv., 12-17 ; Mark i., 14, 15 ; Luke iv., 14, 15.*

While Matthew and Mark agree in making John to have been imprisoned by Herod before the departure of Jesus into Galilee, and while Matthew's phraseology seems to imply a causal relation between the two occurrences, Luke assigns no motive for the change and says nothing about John in this connection. The Fourth Gospel stands by itself in placing the apprehension of John at a considerably later date, and first brings Jesus into Galilee at the time of the marriage-feast in Cana,<sup>1</sup> of which the Synoptics make no mention. When Capernaum, where Jesus made his home after leaving Nazareth, is spoken of by Matthew as being *in the borders of Zebulun and Naphtali*, it is not to be inferred that this region was at that time inhabited by these two tribes. The former possessors of the land are mentioned because of the reference to them in the quotation<sup>2</sup> which is about to be introduced. Isaiah wrote with reference to a threatened invasion from Assyria in the first half of the eighth century B.C.—an attack not successfully resisted, as in his excess of hopefulness he predicted that it would be. Since the hardships consequent upon this invasion bore heaviest upon the provinces here named, the fact that Jesus first preached there leads the evangelist to look upon this enlightenment of the people as the real fulfilment of the prophecy. When, as reported by Mark, Jesus said *the time is fulfilled*, he meant that

\* Literally, "snare" or "trap."

<sup>1</sup> John iii., 24, ii., 1.

<sup>2</sup> Is. ix., 1, 2 (viii., 23). Neither the reading of the Hebrew nor that of the LXX. is uniformly followed by Matthew. Galilee = the "circuit" or "district."

the time was fully come for the establishment of the Messianic kingdom. This is brought out more distinctly in the next member of the sentence.

Although the burden of the message of Jesus to his countrymen is here expressed in the very form into which the proclamation and summons of John had been condensed, *Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand*, the tenor of his subsequent teaching makes it probable that between his conception of the Messianic reign and that of his predecessor there was a marked difference of which the evangelists here take no note.<sup>1</sup> Mark's last phrase, *the gospel*, must be understood in its original sense of "the good news." To *believe in the gospel* is here to credit the announcement of the near approach of the kingdom of God and to conduct one's self accordingly. The *gospel of God* is a compendious expression for "the gospel of the kingdom of God," which is the reading of some codices and editions.<sup>2</sup>

## § 18. THE CALLING OF THE FIRST DISCIPLES.

*Matt. iv., 18-22; Mark i., 16-20; Luke v., 1-11.*

Of the four original disciples of Jesus three bear Hebrew names—Simon, James, and John. Andrew is a Greek name<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is even possible that, since the later teaching of Jesus was not distinctively a call to repentance, tradition was at fault in making his first message to have been so completely identical with that of John, unless it is to be supposed that there was a marked difference between his very earliest teaching and that of the Sermon on the Mount, which is unlikely. Yet when the twelve went out they "preached that men should repent" (Mark vi., 12). What place repentance held in the teaching of Jesus may be learned from the only other passages in which the subject is mentioned, viz., Matt. xi., 20, 21 = Luke x., 13, xii., 41 = Luke xi., 32; Luke v., 32, xv., 7, xxiv., 47.

<sup>2</sup> We have here, in Luke, the first mention of the preaching of Jesus in the synagogues. On the Jewish Synagogue, see Appendix E.

<sup>3</sup> The Galileans not being of pure Israelitish stock, the possession of a Greek name would be presumptive evidence of its owner having Gentile blood in his veins.

known in literature as early as 400 B.C. In the Fourth Gospel i., 42, it is said that the surname Peter (or rather its Chaldee equivalent, Cephas) was given to Simon by Jesus himself when he called him to be his disciple. In the Gospels Simon is uniformly called Peter, while Paul in his letters, which are of earlier date, almost always speaks of him as Cephas. According to the Third Gospel, Simon, James, and John did not become disciples of Jesus until after he had commenced his ministry of teaching and healing (*a*).

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 67) Since it is implied in John i. that Andrew and Simon became associated with Jesus before his departure into Galilee, some have thought to harmonise the Fourth Gospel with the Synoptics by supposing a double calling and assuming that the two brothers became at first only disciples and not strictly followers of Jesus. But John certainly had no such thought as this, since he mentions no later calling and leaves us to infer that the disciples who went with Jesus to the marriage feast at Cana, and afterwards to Capernaum and to Jerusalem, were those who had joined him while he was still in the region of the Jordan. Since, however, he makes Andrew and Peter to belong to Bethsaida on the lake, the difference between him and the Synoptics is of little importance. That the first disciples of Jesus were Galileans is attested by all the evangelists. Luke's amplified account of the calling of Simon, James, and John, embellished as it is by the story of the wonderful draught of fishes, which hints at the possession by Jesus of a marvellous power over nature, plainly belongs to one of the more recent strata of the Gospel tradition. Strauss and the critics of the Tübingen school consider the story an unhistorical representation of the failure of Christianity to win the acceptance of the Jews and its subsequent marvellous success among the Gentiles.



# § 19. JESUS TEACHES AND HEALS IN THE SYNAGOGUE AT CAPERNAUM.

*Mark i., 21-28; Luke iv., 31-37.*

This is the only section common to Mark and Luke which is not also found in Matthew. That Luke thinks it necessary to mention that Capernaum is in Galilee is an indication that he has in mind other than Jewish readers.<sup>1</sup> The contrast indicated between the teaching of Jesus and that of the scribes consisted in his speaking out of his own conviction of truth, while they cited the authority of others in support of their statements. He was his own sufficient authority. If we except the vague hint at the exercise of supernatural power by Jesus contained in one of the accounts of the calling of the first disciples (see the preceding section), we have here the earliest Synoptic mention of Jesus as a wonder-worker.<sup>2</sup> The marvel described is one of healing, and it excites surprise in the beholders not so much because of the remarkable cure effected as on account of the novelty and simplicity of the method employed. There were plenty of Jewish exorcists who could cast out "unclean spirits," as Jesus himself recognised,<sup>3</sup> but they did it with painful effort, making use of magical rites, while he "cast out the spirits with a word" <sup>4</sup> (a).

## NOTE.

(a, p. 68) It is not without its significance that the first cure performed by Jesus is that of a demoniac. Demonism stands

<sup>1</sup> Here we meet with the word "sabbath" (Hebrew *shabbath*, Greek *sabbatōn* and *sabbata*, Latin *sabbata*) for the first time. See Thayer, art. σαββατον

<sup>2</sup> John ii., 11, makes the turning of water into wine at the marriage-feast in Cana "the beginning of his signs." On the miracles of the N. T., see Appendix K.

<sup>3</sup> See Matt. xii., 27.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. viii., 16.

almost as the type of the diseases the mastery of which is ascribed to him in the Synoptic Gospels.\* Beginning with the present instance of a single cure, afterwards we find many cases grouped together, and although other forms of suffering are relieved, yet in general only this one malady is spoken of by name.† “Preaching and casting out demons” are more than once mentioned in such a way as to imply that these two things constituted the whole of the work of Jesus during the earliest period of his Galilean ministry.‡ In commissioning the twelve Jesus first of all gives them “authority over unclean spirits to cast them out,” and directs them to exercise this power§; and the first thing said of them, after their preaching has been mentioned, is that “they cast out many devils.”|| When the seventy return from their mission and make report of their success, the only thing recorded is that they said that even the demons ¶ were subject to them.\*\*

## § 20. THE CURING OF PETER'S MOTHER-IN-LAW AND OTHERS.

*Matt. viii., 14-17; Mark i., 29-34; Luke iv., 38-41*

The apostle Paul bears incidental testimony to the fact that Peter was married.<sup>1</sup> It is for the most part difficult if not impossible to determine from the brief narratives of the evangelists the exact nature of the diseases said to have been cured by Jesus. The malady from which the mother-in-law of Peter was suffering is described by Matthew and

\* The Fourth Gospel makes no mention of cures of demoniacal possession.

† Matt. viii., 16; Mark i., 32, 34.

‡ Mark i., 39, iii., 13, 14.

§ Matt. x., 1, 8; Mark vi., 7; Luke ix., 1.

|| Mark vi., 13.

¶ “Demon” is everywhere the best translation for *δαίμων*; “devil” should be reserved for the rendering of *διάβολος*.

\*\* Luke x., 17. On the symptoms and causes of demoniacal possession, see Appendix F.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. ix., 5.

Mark in terms which convey only the impression that feverishness was the most marked symptom of the case. Luke, writing later, magnifies the disease into *a great fever*.<sup>1</sup> While Matthew<sup>2</sup> and Mark<sup>3</sup> simply indicate that Jesus, taking hold of the woman's hand, encouraged her to rise, Luke uses language which, virtually implying personality in the disease, suggests demonism as its cause. That she was able at once to attend to household duties is mentioned as evidence of the completeness of her recovery. The curing of the demoniac in the synagogue and that of Peter's mother-in-law had both occurred upon a sabbath day. That not until sunset, when the sabbath had ended, was Jesus called upon to give help to others, indicates a reluctance, perhaps mingled with religious scruples, on the part of the people, to trespass upon the day of rest.<sup>4</sup> Matthew's quotation<sup>5</sup> is from a passage in which the prophet speaks of that portion of the people of Israel which had been carried away into captivity as suffering for the sins of the whole people. The passage is therefore historical and not prophetic; neither in itself, apart from its connection, does it fitly apply to the healing acts of Jesus, since he did not take upon himself the diseases of those whom he relieved. The section of Isaiah from which Matthew quotes was, however, generally supposed by the Jews to refer to the Messiah.

<sup>1</sup> Galen testifies that in his time physicians divided fevers into "small" and "great."

<sup>2</sup> In Matthew, instead of "touched" (A. V. and R. V.) which suggests magical cure, we should translate "took hold of," in accordance with the usual meaning of the verb.

<sup>3</sup> Mark is not here at variance with Matthew and Luke, the expression used by him (*ἥγειρεν*) not implying a lifting up.

<sup>4</sup> See John v., 1-18.

<sup>5</sup> From Is. liii., 4. The lack of resemblance between the text of Matthew and that of the LXX. suggests that he may have followed the Aramaic synagogue rendering.

## § 21. WITHDRAWAL OF JESUS.

*Mark i., 35-38 ; Luke iv., 42, 43.*

The time of the departure of Jesus from Capernaum is differently stated by Mark and Luke, the former placing it in the latter part of the night and the latter *when it was day*. "Very early in the morning" would represent the fundamental idea in both cases. It would seem that by an early departure Jesus hoped to escape a repetition of the experiences of the previous evening. There was danger that his reputation as a healer of diseases would interfere with his proper work of preaching the gospel. By *desert* is here meant only a solitary place where he might be by himself. When Simon and the rest (in Luke *the multitudes*) "followed him up," and the inhabitants of the city would have retained him there, he gives as a reason for his refusal to remain longer that he must carry elsewhere the message which he has already given to them. *For to this end came I forth* in Mark is hardly the same as *for therefore was I sent* in Luke. The former has reference to his departure from the city, the latter to his divine mission.

## § 22. A TOUR OF PREACHING AND HEALING IN GALILEE.

*Matt. iv., 23-25 ; Mark i., 39 ; Luke v., 44.*

According to the order of Matthew's narrative, Jesus was not yet known as a wonder-worker.<sup>1</sup> Here, in place of the very brief notes of Mark and Luke concerning the first extended public tour<sup>2</sup> of Jesus in Galilee, Matthew gives a comprehensive but condensed statement of the character of his work (*a*). His teaching in the synagogues is described

<sup>1</sup> It is to be noticed that the cures of § 20 come later in Matthew's Gospel.

<sup>2</sup> The contents of § 17 refer only to the very beginning of his work in a comparatively limited field.

simply as a proclamation of the "good news of the kingdom"—the "good news of God" of Mark i., 14. So far as there is any distinction to be recognised between *disease*<sup>1</sup> and *sickness*,<sup>2</sup> it is one of degree rather than of kind. The statement that all sorts of maladies were cured by Jesus is not substantiated by the particulars given in the record, and is to be looked upon as an artless exaggeration. Repeatedly in the New Testament "all" means "many." So when it is said that all the sick of the great province of Syria were brought to him and cured, we at once recognise the language of hyperbole.<sup>3</sup> Besides the general expression *diseases and torments*, which is the same as "painful diseases," and demonianism, already met with, we here have mention of epilepsy and palsy. The substitution of *epileptic* for "lunatic" in the Revised Version does not represent a change in the original text, but only signifies that the Greek word used, while indicating that the disease in question is one which was supposed to be affected by changes in the moon, does not mean "moon-struck" in the sense of "insane." As for the *palsied* or paralytic, they were those who were suffering from some weakness of the limbs, but not necessarily afflicted with what is now commonly spoken of as "palsy" or "paralysis," which science, however, comprehensively defines as "any kind of loss, temporary or permanent, of sensation or of ability to move or to control motion."

## NOTE.

(a, p. 71) The passage appears to be descriptive of a condition of things existing only at a somewhat later period. Meyer

<sup>1</sup> νόσος, *nōsōs*.

<sup>2</sup> μαλακία, *malakia* : "weakness" rather than "sickness."

<sup>3</sup> The theory ingeniously developed by De Quincey, that Jesus deliberately assumed the character of a travelling physician in order to avoid exciting the suspicion of revolutionary tendencies which might attach to him as a mere haranguer of the people, receives no support from anything related in the Gospels.

holds that "the description is manifestly exaggerated as regards the time of the *first* ministry of Jesus," and he finds in the passage indications of "the work of a later hand in the redaction of our Gospel." Verse 23 seems like a reproduction out of place of Matt. ix., 35. The *Short Protestant Commentary* ascribes a too artificial character to the structure of the First Gospel when it makes the following extended discourse (the Sermon on the Mount) to have been introduced as a specimen of the teachings of Jesus, and chapters viii. and ix. to have been intended only as an example of the cures spoken of here in verse 23. Besides, the Sermon on the Mount was not Messianic preaching, like that here referred to.

### § 23. THE HEALING OF A LEPER.

*Matt. viii., 1-4 ; Mark i., 40-45 ; Luke v., 12-16.*

Although this is the first act of healing of which Matthew gives any detailed account, he does not necessarily mean to represent it as the very earliest of the cures performed by Jesus. The preceding discourse is given a later place by Luke, who also introduces two other accounts of cures<sup>1</sup> before this. The leprous man is said to have come to Jesus (when he was in one of the cities of Galilee, according to Luke) and, courteously saluting him, to have sought relief from what was not only a troublesome disease but, in the eye of the law, a disqualification for intercourse with one's fellow-men and especially for joining them in the religious services of the temple. "Master" or "Sir," and not *Lord*, is the proper rendering of his salutation<sup>2</sup> as given by Matthew

<sup>1</sup> See § 19, 20.

<sup>2</sup> κύριε, *kuriē*. Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Genevan Version all have the rendering "master." In Matt. xxi., 30 (where a son addresses his father as κύριε), in Matt. xiii., 27 (where servants salute their master in the same way), in Matt. xxvii., 63 (where this is the salutation to the Roman governor Pilate), and in John iv., 11, 15, 19, 49, v., 7 (where Jesus is addressed), and elsewhere, both the A. V. and the R. V. translate "sir." Thus far in the Gospels the term

and Luke. Of the three several forms of expression used by the three evangelists to denote the manner of the man's obeisance, Matthew's is the general one already met with,<sup>1</sup> which, since it indicates only a respectful bodily attitude, is mistranslated *worshipped*. The three accounts all agree as to the form in which the leper rather intimated than expressed his wish to be healed by Jesus : *if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean*. The action of Jesus in touching him and the immediately following cure are also described in almost identical language by the three. This close resemblance is an indication either of there having been a common channel of tradition from which they all drew, or else of some direct dependence upon one another. The disease of which the man is said to have been cured, although called "leprosy,"<sup>2</sup> is not thereby identified with the disease known to-day by that name (*a*). Even the strong statement of Luke's account (showing an exaggeration of the earlier tradition), that the man was *full of leprosy*, only points to a pronounced case of some form of cutaneous disease covering a large part of the body (*b*).

## NOTES.

(*a*, p. 74) The Old Testament term *tzahra'ath*, translated in the English Bible "leprosy," is generic rather than specific, being used to denote several cutaneous affections having certain characteristics in common.\* The descriptions of the κύριος (never, however, used vocatively) has been applied only to the Deity. The idea of superiority or authority is all that is fundamental in the meaning of the word.

<sup>1</sup> προσκυνέω. See § 3 (*b*).

<sup>2</sup> λέπρα, *lepra*. See *The Diseases of the Bible*, by Dr. Risdon Bennett, ch. i.

\* Etymologically the word may apply to all diseases in which *scales* or *scabs* are formed upon the skin,—just as a certain plague to which sheep are subject is called the "scab"; or it may come from a root signifying "to strike," the disease in question being looked upon as a "stroke" from the hand of God,—just as we often speak of an attack of paralysis as a "stroke." 2 Chron. xxvi., 20, is somewhat

symptoms of leprosy given in the Old Testament\* are of no scientific value. True leprosy is, with the rarest exceptions, an incurable malady, ultimately affecting the entire system; but the Levitical law, in providing for the authoritative priestly recognition of the recovery of those afflicted with *tzahra'ath* bore witness not only to its curability but also to the fact that cures were frequent enough to make it worth while to establish a law of procedure for the rehabilitation of convalescents. It is inconceivable that the leper of this account should have had such faith in the healing power of Jesus (not before manifested, so far as it appears, in the restoring of anyone afflicted with leprosy) as to suppose that he could cure what everybody knew to be a fatal disease. All the circumstances indicate that the man was suffering from some disorder not fitly described by the English word "leprosy." What the Bible dictionaries say of "leprosy" is therefore, for the most part, of no value for the illustration of the present narrative.

(*b*, p. 74) Whatever may have been the exact nature of the disease of the man here called a leper, the mere fact of the telling of the story by all the synoptists is sufficient evidence that the immediacy of the cure was considered marvellous. The difficulty of understanding how any affection of the skin having even a remotely leprous character could yield to a word and a touch has led to the bringing forward of other hypotheses than the one accepted by the evangelists that Jesus was endowed with remarkable wonder-working power. (1) By supporters of the earlier form of the mythical hypothesis, who were constantly finding in the record of the life of Jesus incidents having no other foundation than a desire on the part of some of his followers that he should be thought to have paralleled striking events in Old Testament history, his asserted healing of lepers was reduced to a mere imitation of the story of the wonderful cure of Naaman.† This hypothesis now has few if any defenders. (2) The modern Dutch school of criticism likewise looks upon the favourable to the second derivation. When *tzahra'ath* is predicated of garments and the walls of houses (Lev. xiii., 47-59, xiv., 33-57) probably mouldiness is intended.

\* Lev. xiii.-xiv.; Ex. iv., 6; Num. xii., 10 ff.; 2 Kings v., 27; 2 Chron. xxvi., 19, 20.

† 2 Kings v.



story as unhistorical, but traces it to a different source, making it to have been originally intended as a symbolic representation of the helpful relation which Jesus sustained to the outcasts of society. It is conceived that he having often figuratively called himself a physician, and the foul conditions of leprosy furnishing the fittest possible symbol of the disease of sin, his cures of moral leprosy became transformed, in the thought of the succeeding age, into cures of the bodily disease. This supposition rests upon no solid basis of ascertainable fact, since the Gospels only once\* make Jesus refer to himself, and then indirectly, as a physician of souls. (3) There remains the theory that the evangelists, although describing an actual historical event, through a misconception represent as marvellous what was in fact a very simple and natural occurrence. This hypothesis rests upon the well-known tendency of stories to grow in the frequent telling. The starting-point of this transformation is found in the ambiguity which attaches to the expression "to make clean," † which may have either a literal or a figurative meaning—may denote, in a case of this kind, either a removal of the impurities of the diseased body, or the restoration of the sufferer, after the departure of the disease, to the enjoyment of those social and religious rights of which he had been deprived during the period of his affliction, ‡—to which secondary meaning the tertiary one of "to pronounce clean" is closely related. It is in this last sense,

\* See the parallel passages Matt. ix., 12; Mark ii., 17; Luke v., 31.

† καθαριζειν (*katharizēin*) = the classical καθαίρειν.

‡ Cp. καθ. τινα φόρον, *to cleanse one of* [the stain of] *murder*; also the English law-phrase *to purge one's self of contempt of court*. In Heb. ix., 14, there is a good illustration of the figurative use of καθαριζειν, where the blood of Christ is said to cleanse [A. V., "purge"] the conscience from dead works,—the word "dead" having been chosen with reference to the ceremonial impurity contracted by coming in contact with a dead body. So in Heb. ix., 13, the corresponding substantive καθαρότης, "cleanness," is used of the technical purity required by the Levitical law. Sophocles, *Lexicon of Later and Byzantine Greek*, gives "to clear, in a legal sense," as one of the meanings of καθαριζειν. Thayer's and Robinson's N. T. lexicons give as a secondary meaning of καθ. "*to pronounce clean* in a Levitical sense," "*to declare clean.*"

in which it is the equivalent of the Hebrew *tihar*, that the LXX. use the word in Lev. xiii., 6, 13, 17, 23, 28, in all which passages "pronounce clean" is the rendering both of the Authorised Version and the Revised Version. Now these passages are precisely the ones which treat of the ceremonial purification of lepers and so fix for us the usage of the LXX. with regard to *katharizein*.\* The inference thought to be legitimately deducible from these facts is that Jesus, perceiving from the condition of the ailing man that there was no longer any reason for his remaining under ban, assured him that, to secure the removal of his disability, he had only to go and show himself to the priest and comply with the other requirements of the ceremonial law. Later, when Jesus had become well known as a healer of diseases, the statement that he had made the man clean was understood literally and in this sense found its way into the Gospels. There is but one other account † (and that very likely a duplicate of this) of a healing of leprosy by Jesus. Cases of this disease were very common, and, considering the inability of ordinary physicians to effect a cure, had he possessed this power he must often have been called upon for its exercise, and the Synoptics could not have failed to testify to the fact.

## § 24. THE HEALING OF TEN LEPERS.

*Luke xvii., 11-19.*

An analysis of this narrative discloses, together with some striking resemblances to the account of the preceding section, several points of difference. The time is the last journey of Jesus to Jerusalem; the place, some village upon the route.<sup>1</sup>

\* In Lev. xvi., 30, the priest who offers a sacrifice for the sins of the people is said thereby to cleanse the people, "cleanse" being the A. V. and R. V. representative of *tihar* in the Hebrew and of *katharizein* in the Greek of the LXX. In Mark vii., 19, and Acts x., 15, xi., 9, *καθ.* is used in the sense of to declare clean, which is sufficient to establish this as a first-century meaning of the word in Christian circles.

† Luke xvii., 11-19 (§ 24).

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Luke xiii., 22.

Instead of one leper there are ten, who do not approach Jesus and prostrate themselves before him, but remain at a distance, in accordance with the requirements of the law,<sup>1</sup> and call to him for help. They are cleansed, not immediately, but soon after leaving him. These differences were Luke's warrant for making of the account a distinct narrative (*a*).

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 78) It is, however, questionable, considering the essential likeness of the later to the earlier narrative and the fact that Luke here stands alone, whether the two stories had not a common origin. The main point of difference is one with regard to which variations in a narrative are most likely to occur—that of number. The further intensification of the wonder of the curing of the ten by representing it as taking place only after they have left the presence of Jesus introduces the magical element of healing at a distance (verse 14), to which is added (verse 19), either as cause or condition, the possession of faith by the sufferer.\* The incident of the return of the Samaritan to express his gratitude, while the other nine apparently remain unthankful, is looked upon by some as an addition to the account due to later anti-Jewish feeling ; but there is nothing in the narrative to indicate that the nine were Jews rather than Galileans. Such a universalistic tendency as is supposed to be here displayed, if at all active in the minds of the Gospel writers, would naturally have led to the recording of other instances in which Jesus gave aid to Samaritans ; but, although teaching in various parts of their country, it is not mentioned that he ever again cured one of its inhabitants. His well known real interest in them, however, may have led to the legendary introduction of a Samaritan into this account.

<sup>1</sup> See Lev. xiii., 46.

\* Cp. Matt. ix., 22 (Mark v., 34) ; Mark x., 52 (Luke xviii., 42).

## § 25. THE HEALING OF A PARALYTIC.

*Matt. ix., 1-8; Mark ii., 1-12; Luke v., 17-26.*

These three accounts of the healing of one who is called a paralytic,<sup>1</sup> while evidently sustaining a close relation to one another, differ very much as to their degree of fulness. Mark and Luke, and especially the former, preserve many picturesque details which are wanting in Matthew (*a*). Matthew's expression *his own city*, by which he refers to Capernaum, is peculiar to this passage, and Mark's *at home*<sup>2</sup> does not appear again in the Gospels. Luke, besides mentioning the fact that Jesus was occupied with teaching and had among his auditors Pharisees and doctors of the law, who had come from far and near, intimates (verse 17) that at this time his healing power was particularly active. Mark and Luke say that, because of the crowd which filled the house to overflowing, the sick man could not be taken in by the usual entrance, but that those who carried him were obliged to go upon the housetop and make an opening in the roof through which to let him down into the room where Jesus was.<sup>3</sup> This apartment would be likely to be the upper chamber of a house of two stories, that part of the Oriental dwelling being not unfrequently used among the Jews as a place for meeting and teaching.<sup>4</sup> The only symptom of disease mentioned by

<sup>1</sup>No other specific case of this disease is mentioned in the N. T. excepting the one spoken of in Matt. viii., 6.

<sup>2</sup>The better (marginal) rendering of ἐν οἴκῳ. Cp. 1 Cor. xi., 34, xiv., 35. The form of expression = the German *zu Hause*.

<sup>3</sup>The flat roof of an Oriental house may often be reached by an outer staircase.

<sup>4</sup>Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*, cites these three passages from the Talmuds:

"These are the traditions which they taught in the upper chamber of Hananiah, Ben Hezekiah, Ben Garon." "The elders went up into an upper chamber in Jericho. They went up also into an upper chamber in Jabneh." "Rabbi Jochanan and his disciples went up into an upper chamber and read and expounded."

the evangelist is the helplessness of the sick man, who had to be carried into the presence of Jesus. Considering that the words of encouragement addressed to him and the command to arise and go to his home were efficacious in restoring the use of his limbs, the case would seem to have been one of what modern physicians call "hysterical paralysis," in which, as Dr. W. B. Carpenter says, "the difficulty lies not so much in the *want of power* as in the want of that *belief in the possession of the power* which is essential to its exercise, and which yields most readily to "a *confident expectation of cure*." When Jesus said to the invalid "Courage, child! forgiven are thy sins," he used language especially fitted to arouse the drooping spirits of the man and inspire him with confidence. It was one of the fundamental conceptions of Jewish theology that not only bodily suffering and disease but all calamities were the divinely ordained punishment for sin,<sup>1</sup> and that the removal of the penalty implied the forgiveness of the offence for which it had been imposed. It was, then, in itself immaterial whether the sick man was told that he was no longer sick, or that his sins had been forgiven,—whether the fact was stated from the point of view of the theologian or of the physician. When some of the scribes and Pharisees were scandalised at Jesus' using language which they chose to interpret as an assumption by him of the divine prerogative, also making it evident by their behaviour that they doubted his ability really to cure the man, he showed that it was as easy for him to do the healing deed as to say the forgiving word.<sup>2</sup> The state of mind of the people, as described at the end of the narrative in Matthew and Luke, was not

<sup>1</sup> Luke xiii., 5, and John ix., 1-3, represent Jesus as combating this view.

<sup>2</sup> Instead of saying "*I have power*," he says "*the Son of Man has power*"; but in his Aramaic speech "son of man" meant any man, man in general. He declares that there is in man healing and therefore forgiving power. See Appendix G.

one of "fear," in the usual sense of that term, but only of awe in the presence of what they considered a wonderful manifestation of divine providence.

NOTE.

(a, p. 79) The agreements in those portions which all have in common are such as to preclude the idea of an altogether independent origin of the three accounts. Matthew would seem either to have abridged Mark's narrative or to have followed a briefer proto-Mark; while Luke's account has so much more in common with our present Mark as to suggest a still closer relation to it.

§ 26. THE CALLING OF LEVI-MATTHEW

*Matt. ix., 9-13; Mark ii., 13-17; Luke v., 27-32.*

Each of the historical books excepting the Fourth Gospel<sup>1</sup> has a list of the immediate "disciples" (*i. e.*, learners) and followers of Jesus called apostles, and in all Matthew appears as one of the twelve, but not Levi. Since the Synoptics in this section all evidently speak of one and the same person and of one who, though not here designated as an apostle, was yet summoned to be a constant companion of Jesus, it is probable that he who was known as Levi before being called to the apostolate became afterwards better known in Christian circles as Matthew.<sup>2</sup> Luke makes clear what is left doubtful by Matthew and Mark, that Levi, after his call to be a follower of Jesus, "made a great reception for him at his

<sup>1</sup> Matt. x., 2-4; Mark iii., 16-19; Luke vi., 14-16; Acts i., 13.

<sup>2</sup>This implies inaccuracy on the part of the redactor of the First Gospel in speaking of him as though his name were Matthew at the time of his calling. Outside of the Gospels, but perhaps depending upon them, there is this testimony in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (8, 22) to the identity of Matthew and Levi: "I Matthew, who am also Levi, formerly a publican, make these constitutions."

house" (a). The "sinners" who were present with the tax-gatherers—the latter probably either Levi's subordinates in office or port-collectors from the neighbouring villages along the lake—are here met with for the first time in the New Testament, but are constantly appearing later. Luke, when speaking in his own person, does not, like Matthew and Mark, couple "publicans" and "sinners," but says (verse 29) "publicans and others," that is, others who occupied the same social position among the Jews as the tax-gatherers.<sup>2</sup> The reply of Jesus to the criticism of the Pharisees upon his conduct in associating with persons of ill-repute takes the form of a proverb familiar to Greeks as well as Jews.<sup>3</sup> According to Matthew he also quotes from one of the

<sup>1</sup> ἁμαρτωλοί, *hamartōloi*. The ethical signification of *hamartolos*, "sinner," and *hamartia*, "sin" (the latter already met with repeatedly in preceding sections), and the verb *hamartanēin* (ἁμαρτάνειν), "to sin" (occurring frequently in the N. T.), is not a part of the root-meaning of these words. Primarily the verb means "to miss the mark," *hamartia* denoting the fact of failure and *hamartolos* the actor. The secondary meaning of these words is, however, of very early growth, and in the LXX., where *hamartolos* is applied nearly 100 times to violators of the law of Jehovah, we find their ethical signification fully fixed. Not only their constant predicates make this plain, but also the synonymes with which they are often coupled. Thus in Gen. xiii., 13, the inhabitants of Sodom are called "wicked men and *hamartoloi*," and in Prov. xi., 31, with the just man is contrasted "the irreligious and *hamartolos*." Is i., 28, declares that "the lawless ones" will be crushed and "the *hamartoloi*" with them. In Paul's letter to the Galatians, ii., 15, all who are not Jews are spoken of as "sinners,"—"we by nature Jews and not sinners of the Gentiles." In the present passage the O. T. distinction between "righteous" and "sinners" is preserved.

<sup>2</sup> But cp. Luke xv., 1, the only exception.

<sup>3</sup> According to Diogenes Laërtius, when Antisthenes was reproved for associating with men of depraved character, he reminded the fault-finders that physicians are accustomed to associate with the sick. The same sentiment in a slightly different form is credited to Pausanias by Plutarch.

prophetic books of the Old Covenant <sup>1</sup> an utterance ascribed to Jehovah, *I desire mercy*<sup>2</sup> and not sacrifice.<sup>3</sup> As applied by Jesus to the Pharisees, "sacrifice" stands for the punctilious observance of the commands of the ceremonial law, for which they were distinguished.

## NOTE.

(a, p. 82) The tax-gatherer at an important point upon the lake, which was also upon the direct line of travel from Damascus to Jerusalem and the far south, might be rich enough to occupy a commodious house and provide a feast for such numbers (Luke's *great crowd*), but hardly Jesus and his disciples with their scanty treasury. It is, nevertheless, somewhat difficult to understand how Pharisees, with their strict notions concerning eating and drinking with Gentiles and those who were no better than Gentiles (see Acts xi., 3 ; Gal. ii., 12), could be present at a feast in the house of a tax-gatherer, even though not themselves partaking of the food.

## § 27 A QUESTION ABOUT FASTING ANSWERED.

*Matt. ix., 14-17 ; Mark ii., 18-22 ; Luke v., 33-39.*

Mark alone tells us what led to the conversation reported in this section. That the disciples of John fasted like the Pharisees is an indication that the Baptist, with all his boldness of thinking and acting, had not renounced his allegiance to the traditional law, to the requirements of which, at least in this respect, Jesus and his disciples gave no heed. The

<sup>1</sup> Hos. vi., 6. The quotation corresponds exactly with the text of the Alexandrian MS. of the LXX.

<sup>2</sup> ἔλεος (*elēōs*), "mercy," represents the Hebrew *hesedh*, which Hosea uses in the sense of "piety" or "goodness," and which the A. V. translates "goodness" in Hosea vi., 4, the R. V. having in the margin "kindness." The primary meaning of *hesedh* is "love," "good-will," of which ἔλεος, "mercy," is only one manifestation.

<sup>3</sup> He again makes use of the words in Matt. xii., 7.



question here is not of specially appointed fasts, which all were bound to keep, but of those private fastings the observance of which was considered a special merit. Monday and Thursday were the regular fast-days, and some of the "unco guid" fasted on these days the year through. In general, however, to fast twice a week was considered sufficient to establish a reputation for piety.<sup>1</sup> A three-days' fast, on Monday, Thursday, and Monday, was not uncommon. Jesus, who seldom says anything at all about fasting, and never speaks of it but to condemn it when practised in the spirit of religious asceticism, here lays down the principle that fasting is only becoming as the natural manifestation of sorrow and grief. He declares that his disciples have no reason for fasting so long as he is with them; just as the friends of the bridegroom,<sup>2</sup> who conduct the bride to the house of the husband and join in the gayety of the marriage-feast, can have no feeling of sadness in his presence. When the Synoptics represent him as referring to the time of a coming separation from his disciples, it is probable that the crucifixion of Jesus is in the minds of the narrators, and that they write out of a precise knowledge of his fate which he did not himself possess thus early in his career. By the use of the new figures of the putting of a patch of unfulled cloth upon an old garment and the fresh, unfermented juice of the grape in old wine-skins,<sup>3</sup> he brings out more clearly the idea

<sup>1</sup> See the boast of the Pharisee in Luke xviii., 12: "I fast twice in the week." Cp. the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, ch. viii.: "They [the hypocrites] fast on the second of the week and the fifth."

<sup>2</sup> *The sons of the bride-chamber*,—a form of expression not found elsewhere in the N. T. Sonship, in the N. T., is the type of all close relationship of whatever kind.

<sup>3</sup> Receptacles for wine and other liquids were made, and are to this day in some parts of the East, from the skins of small animals and especially goats, by tying up the openings of the tanned pelt which had been drawn off as nearly whole as possible. Wine-skins hung up in the dwelling and exposed to its heat and smoke became so

that his teaching is not to be cramped within the narrow limits of the law of tradition. He does not deny that the religion of the fathers may yet have its value, just as the old stiff wine-skins may serve to hold the wine which is no longer working. In Luke this thought is expanded in the added words of verse 39, in which the satisfaction of the Pharisees with the established form of the national religion is compared with the content of the drinker of old wine, who says that that is good enough for him. We have here one of the fruitful germs of the later Pauline doctrine.

### § 28. FIRST UTTERANCE CONCERNING THE SABBATH.

*Matt xii., 1-8; Mark ii., 23-28; Luke vi., 1-5.*

The time of this occurrence is stated indefinitely by Matthew and Mark and obscurely by Luke, who uses a phrase<sup>1</sup> the literal meaning of which is plain but whose application is altogether uncertain. When it is said that Jesus and his disciples went through (or between) "sown fields,"<sup>2</sup> it is perhaps implied that they were following one of the beaten paths which separated contiguous fields, although some understand Mark to declare that they were making a path for themselves as they went. Mark says only that they *plucked* the ears of grain,<sup>3</sup> the others that they also ate them,

hard after a time that they could not be used with safety for any fermenting liquid.

<sup>1</sup> δευτερόπρωτος (*deuterōprōtōs*), "second-first." The many conjectural interpretations of the word, which is found nowhere else, serve only to emphasise the fact that nothing certain is known with regard to its denotation.

<sup>2</sup> σπορίμων (*spōrimōn*), fields sown with any kind of grain,—Americans say "grain-fields," and Englishmen, "corn-fields."

<sup>3</sup> στάχυας (*stachuas*),—a word found elsewhere in the N. T. only in Mark iv., 28.

Luke adding that they rubbed out the kernels with their hands. This rubbing would add to the heinousness of their offence in the eyes of the Pharisees, by whom it would be considered one of the kinds of labour forbidden to be performed upon the sabbath.<sup>1</sup> It was not the law, but the law as interpreted by tradition, which condemned such an act.<sup>2</sup> Jesus does not attempt the practically impossible by trying to show his critics that their traditions have no binding force, but instead asserts their fundamental misconception of the very purpose of the institution of the sabbath. He prepares the way for a distinct and explicit statement of the principle on which this ordinance rests, by citing cases in which it had been and still was recognised by the highest authority. David had entered into the house of God (the tabernacle) and, by permission of the priest, taken for himself and his companions in need the loaves of bread which had been consecrated to the Lord.<sup>3</sup> Here necessity was recognised as being above ritual. Again, the priests constantly performed certain labour upon the sabbath in discharge of their official duties, and the law recognised the necessity and consequent legitimacy of this labour.<sup>4</sup> The former illustration elucidates the general principle, the latter gives an instance of the application of this principle to sabbath observance.<sup>5</sup> When Jesus adds, according to Matthew,

<sup>1</sup> One of the Jewish fathers declares that simply "to pluck the ears of grain is a kind of reaping," so that the rubbing out of the kernels would be an additional offence, adding threshing to harvesting.

<sup>2</sup> Deut. xxiii., 25, allows one to pluck what grain he pleases as he goes through a neighbour's field, but not to make use of a sickle.

<sup>3</sup> See 1 Sam. xxi., 1-6. The "shew-bread," or "bread of presentation," was renewed daily, the loaves which were removed becoming "common bread," and a perquisite of the attendant priest. Mark's mention of Abiathar as high-priest at this time presents a chronological difficulty of no importance, borrowed from the O. T.

<sup>4</sup> See Num. xxviii., 9, 10.

<sup>5</sup> Only Matthew has the second illustration, probably added to the account because of its pertinency. It is found nowhere else.

that there is there that which is greater than the temple, he does not, as is implied in the common rendering, refer to himself, but rather to that gospel which he came to preach, the gospel of human well-being. It is a placing of the new life of the spirit above the old worship of the letter. The concluding declaration of the lordship of the Son of Man over the sabbath is deduced, in Mark, from the important premise that this day was set apart for rest solely for the good of man, with the implication that a regard for this good justifies at any time a disregard of the day. Although intended by Jesus only as a justification of the conduct of his disciples as they passed through the grain-fields on the sabbath, the argument admits of no limitations, but establishes the universal supremacy of that which is helpful to man over that which is merely conventional.<sup>1</sup>

#### § 29. RENEWAL OF THE SABBATH CONTROVERSY

*Matt. xii., 9-14, Mark iii., 1-6; Luke vi., 6-11.*

The healing of a withered hand on the sabbath (Luke alone says that it was another sabbath), while an act of sympathetic helpfulness, yet is chiefly significant as having furnished the occasion for further teaching concerning the legitimate use of the day of rest. It is quite impossible to tell, from the very meagre description here given, what was the exact condition of the man's hand. No other similar cases are mentioned in the New Testament, except in the most general way and in a single passage.<sup>2</sup> Also from the

<sup>1</sup> Here, as in § 25, it appears from the context that Jesus must have used the Aramaic phrase "son of man" with reference not to himself particularly, but to every member of the human family. Had his words been rendered according to their original meaning, we should have had here simply "man is lord of the sabbath." See Appendix G.

<sup>2</sup> John v., 3.

two instances of this affection mentioned in the Old Testament<sup>1</sup> no help can be derived toward the understanding of the present case. Mark's use of the participle instead of the simple adjective to denote the relaxed condition of the hand indicates that the disability was induced and not congenital. Luke alone mentions the scribes and Pharisees as the ones who watched Jesus to see if he would heal on the sabbath ; but in Matthew and Mark the indefinite subject of the verb naturally points to the Pharisees of the preceding section. The object of these spies, it appears, was to collect distinct evidence upon which to accuse him before the constituted authorities. His free form of teaching and acting in utter disregard of the law of tradition is already exciting their animosity, and they purpose to bring legal restraint to bear upon him. According to Mark and Luke they only watched him to see what he would do ; but Matthew says that they asked him whether it was lawful to heal on the sabbath, receiving from him a distinctly affirmative answer resting upon premises the truth of which they could not deny.<sup>2</sup> Mark and Luke, with almost exact agreement, make Jesus reply to the unspoken thought of those who are watching him with hostile purpose by commanding the man to step forward where all can see him. Then, pausing, he puts to them the searching question, which they apparently deem it prudent not to answer, " Is the sabbath a day for doing good or for doing harm, for saving life or for destroying it ? " The first form of the alternative is general, the second specific. Jesus does not recognise the middle ground of simply doing

<sup>1</sup> 1 Kings xiii., 4 ; Zech. xi., 17. On the supposed nature of the disease spoken of in the Bible as the " withering of the hand," see Jahn's *Biblical Archaeology*, § 199, iv.

<sup>2</sup> It may be that the law did not formally authorise a man to save his property from destruction on the sabbath, but the confidence with which Jesus assumes that a sheep would be rescued from a pit into which it had fallen even on that day shows what was at least allowed by custom.

nothing. With him not to do was to undo. Not to cure the man would be to leave him to suffer if not to perish. By his Socratic method of teaching through interrogation he makes the silence of his questioners testify to the truth of his doctrine and the consequent rectitude of his conduct. The glance which Mark says that he gave them cannot have been one of *anger*, if accompanied by grief for their mental blindness ("hardness of heart"), and even "indignation," the strongest allowable word, may not suitably represent his actual Aramaic speech. When, at the command of Jesus, the man stretched forth his hand, immediately recovering its use, according to Matthew and Mark they<sup>1</sup> began at once to plot his ruin, while Luke represents them as being in a state of some perplexity and taking time to consider what course they should pursue with regard to him.

### § 30. HEALING OF AN INFIRM WOMAN.

*Luke xiii., 10-17.*

The woman who is here spoken of is said to have been an invalid for eighteen years, but the only symptom of disease mentioned is her being bent over and unable to assume an erect posture. As the result of the assurance of Jesus that she is free from her infirmity, she is at once able to stand upright. In this, as in some other cases,<sup>2</sup> it may have been thought that personal contact with Jesus had in it a magic power of cure. In the expression *a spirit of infirmity* (verse 11) we trace the influence of the popular belief that disease was very often the result of possession by evil spirits. Even Jesus himself speaks in accordance with this view in verse 16,

<sup>1</sup> Matthew mentions only the Pharisees, but Mark connects with them the Herodians, or partisans of Herod, spoken of elsewhere in the N. T. only in Matt. xxii., 16, and Mark xii., 13.

<sup>2</sup> For example, Mark iii., 10; Luke vi., 19.

although using language which can only be understood figuratively. The ruler of the synagogue only indirectly criticises Jesus for healing on the sabbath, preferring to find fault with the people for bringing their sick to the synagogue on that day of the week. Jesus,<sup>1</sup> understanding that the criticism is really aimed at him, makes direct reply, addressing not only the ruler but all those present who were of his way of thinking. In calling them hypocrites<sup>2</sup> he charges them with displaying a zeal for the purity of the sabbath which was not genuine, since they themselves were accustomed to subordinate its strict observance to their own personal interests. This stinging epithet is only a concise *argumentum ad hominem*; the following questions are an *argumentum a fortiori* "if an ox or an ass tied in the stall for a few hours can be loosed on the sabbath in order that it may relieve its thirst, with how much more propriety may a human being, and she a favoured daughter of Abraham, who has been for many years in bondage, be released upon this day?"<sup>3</sup>

### § 31. HEALING OF A DROPSICAL MAN.

*Luke xiv., 1-6.*

The one here called a "ruler"<sup>4</sup> of the Pharisees was only a prominent man among them, not an official, for there was no organisation of Pharisaism. He may have been a "ruler of the synagogue" of Pharisaic associations and sympathies—a ruler from the number of the Pharisees. After the denunciation just before uttered in the synagogue it seems strange to

<sup>1</sup> Luke here speaks of him as ὁ κύριος, "the master."

<sup>2</sup> A term used in the time of Aristophanes and Plato to denote a play-actor.

<sup>3</sup> For many curious details of the sabbath law of the Jews as interpreted by the rabbis, see Schürer, § 28, II.

<sup>4</sup> ἄρχων, *archōn*.

find Jesus the guest of a Pharisee ; but it may well be that Luke has misplaced the narrative. It was customary to feast more bountifully on the sabbath than during the rest of the week, in honour of the day.<sup>1</sup> Who they were who were watching Jesus we are left to infer from the subsequent mention of lawyers and Pharisees.<sup>2</sup> He is not said to have " answered " any words of theirs, but his question with regard to the lawfulness of healing on the sabbath was called out by what he knew to be the common opinion of the Pharisees on this subject. Again we are at a loss to determine just what was the condition of the man whom Jesus healed, having only the single word *hydrōpikōs* <sup>3</sup> as a description of his disease.

## § 32. A CROWD OF PEOPLE AND MANY CURES.

*Matt. xii., 15-21 ; Mark iii., 7-12 ; Luke vi., 17-19.*

The sea to which, according to Mark, Jesus withdrew was the Sea of Galilee, not far distant. Hitherto those who had gathered to listen to him had been chiefly Galileans ; but now people flocked to him from nearly every part of Palestine, even from the Gentile districts in which the important cities of Tyre and Sidon were situated. They were attracted, however, not so much by the character of his preaching as by the wonderful cures which he was reported to have performed. Foreseeing the necessity of withdrawing himself from this motley crowd, he directs his disciples to have a boat in readiness to receive him. In the meantime he heals such as present themselves to him.<sup>4</sup> Mark intimates and

<sup>1</sup> See Lightfoot's *Horæ Hebraicæ, in loco*.

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix D.

<sup>3</sup> ὑδρωπικός.

<sup>4</sup> Mark says *many*, Matthew *all*.



Luke makes plain that the popular conception of the healing power of Jesus was of a mysterious influence proceeding from his body and operating as if by magic, so that simply to touch him was sufficient to secure relief. Just as the demoniac of § 19 had declared that Jesus was "the holy one of God," by which he meant the Messiah, so now *the unclean spirit* says to him *Thou art the Son of God*. It was conceived that the possessing spirits controlled the demoniacs' organs of speech, and, since they were supposed to have supernatural knowledge, their utterances were looked upon as oracles. The evangelists evidently considered the repeated testimony of the demoniacs to the Messiahship of Jesus to be evidence of the weightiest kind. Jesus himself tries to check the possessed ones and hinder them from adding to the already too great and even dangerous Messianic excitement of the people. In the present instance, Matthew, always ready to find a fulfilment of prophecy in any striking act of Jesus, quotes from the beginning of Is. xlii. to show that his desire to avoid publicity was a truly Messianic trait. Since the Targums make this passage Messianic, Matthew's application of it to Jesus was going only one step beyond the Jewish scholarship of his time (*a*).

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 92) The quotation does not exactly correspond with any Greek or Hebrew original, though conforming much more nearly to the Hebrew text than to that of any extant Greek translation. It has been conjectured that its source may have been an oral Aramaic synagogue version. As to the originally intended application of the passage, an examination of it in its proper connection discloses the fact that no individual (and consequently not Jesus) was in the prophet's mind. The "servant" of Jehovah is the righteous portion of the people of Israel taken collectively. That the LXX. so understood the passage appears from their rendering, "Jacob is my servant                      Israel is my chosen one." The people of Israel are spoken of as gentle and peaceful in

comparison with neighbouring nations, which were turbulent and addicted to violence.\*

### § 33. CALLING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES.

*Matt. x., 2-4 ; Mark iii., 13-19 ; Luke vi., 12-16.*

When Mark and Luke say that Jesus went up into *the mountain*, the reference is probably to the hill nearest at hand ; but some take the word to be descriptive of the high land as distinguished from the plain, and not to refer to any particular elevation. Luke alone mentions that he spent the night there in prayer and when morning came called to him his disciples. Mark says that he summoned, not all his disciples, but those "whom he himself wanted" to have come to him. The use of the intensive pronoun "himself" emphasises the expression of this personal feeling. From these he chooses twelve to be his helpers. Matthew makes no mention of the circumstances of their calling, but merely gives a list of their names. Mark tells why Jesus attached them to himself—that he might enjoy their companionship and that they might share with him his labours of teaching and healing, now becoming too great for his unaided strength.<sup>1</sup> These twelve Luke says that he called *apostles*, *i. e.*, missionaries, "men sent out," and Matthew also here, but here only, applies to them this term.<sup>2</sup> Commonly in the Gospels

\* For a fuller consideration of the original meaning of the verses quoted, together with a presentation of the several forms of the text, see Noyes's *Translation of the Hebrew Prophets*, vol. i., "Introduction," xlviii.-lvi.; Toy, 34-36. The subject of the "Servant of Yahweh" is also treated by Carpenter, *The First Three Gospels*, 128-131.

<sup>1</sup> The fact that the apostles seem not to have accomplished nor even attempted much during the lifetime of Jesus gives colour to the hypothesis that at first he wished only to place them in training for future work which he did not live to assign to them.

<sup>2</sup> In Mark the word is found only in vi., 30, while John, although having it once (xiii., 16), employs it only in a generic sense. It

they are not distinguished from the rest of the disciples. While the selection of just twelve may have been purely accidental, it is more likely that the original number of the Jewish tribes had made twelve a favourite number—a round number as it were. That in all the lists of the twelve Peter stands first can hardly be ascribed to mere chance, but must rather be explained as the result of his actual preëminence among the apostles. That the name of Judas, the traitor, stands uniformly at the end of the list also indicates a grouping according to natural fitness. Matthew carries through his catalogue a binary arrangement presenting six pairs of apostles (*a*).

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 94) In eleven of the names all four lists agree ; but whether Judas the son (or brother) of James, or Thaddæus, or Lebbæus, should occupy the remaining place, or whether these are all only different names for one and the same person, criticism has not yet been able to determine.\* One of the twelve—Judas Iscariot—has a surname derived from the place either of his birth or of his residence : he was “Judas of Kerioth.” The Simon who stands next to him in the lists of Matthew and Mark apparently has one surname there and another in Luke and Acts ; but it is probable that “zealot” † in the latter is really the equivalent of “the Cananæan” in the former. ‡

abounds in Acts and the Epistles, but its application is not always limited to the twelve. See Acts xiv., 4, 14 ; 2 Cor. viii., 23 ; Phil. ii., 25 ; 1 Cor. ix., 1, 2. In Heb. iii., 1, Jesus is spoken of as “the apostle and high-priest of our confession.”

\*The text is somewhat uncertain, for, although the R. V. makes no reference to this fact, there is considerable evidence in favour of the reading Lebbæus instead of Thaddæus in Matthew and Mark, and Tisch. adopts Lebbæus in Matthew.

† The Zealots were the extreme nationalist party, fanatical and given to stirring up revolt against Roman authority.

‡ See Thayer, under *Kananaïos* and *Kanavirēs* ; Schürer, I., ii., 80, 81.

## § 34. INTRODUCTION TO THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

*Matt. v., 1, 2 : Luke vi., 20a.*

The teachings contained in Matt. v.–vii. and partly paralleled in Luke, although commonly called a “sermon,” are such only in the generic sense of the term. Either “Discourse upon the Mount” or “Teaching upon the Mount” would be a better title. Reading Matthew’s introduction we get the impression that Jesus went up into the mountain for the purpose of freeing himself from the multitudes. He sits, after the custom of Jewish teachers, while his disciples gather around him. The presence of more than the chosen twelve is not, however, excluded.<sup>1</sup> Luke seems, in vi., 17, to fix the place of this teaching elsewhere than upon the mountain, and some call his form of the discourse the “Sermon on the Plain”; but the “*level*” place” of which he speaks may, without forcing the meaning of the word, be understood of some plateau among the hills, below the summit of “the mount” but above the level of the surrounding country. Raising his eyes as if from meditation (Luke), and opening his mouth (Matthew’s imposing way of saying that he began to speak<sup>2</sup>), he addresses his disciples.

## § 35. THE BEATITUDES.

*Matt. v. 3–12 : Luke vi., 20b–26.*

The first paragraph of the Sermon on the Mount tells who among men are the *blessed* ones. Of Matthew’s seven classes of such Luke mentions only four, but he alone adds four

<sup>1</sup> Matt. vii., 28, and Luke vii., 1, indicate that many more than the immediate disciples of Jesus were present.

<sup>2</sup> *πεδινός* (*pēdinōs*), found only here in the N. T.

<sup>3</sup> A very few instances of a similar form of expression have been noticed in classical writers.

"woes" to his four blessings. These affirmations of blessedness are commonly spoken of as "the beatitudes," because in the Latin Vulgate version each one begins with the word *beati*, "blessed" (*a*). In Luke those declared blessed are of the number of the disciples there present, while in Matthew the use of the third person ("theirs" and "they") would make the declarations more widely applicable were it not that the last beatitude takes the form of the second person, "blessed are *ye*," as in Luke, which suggests that the meaning in the previous instances is "blessed are *those of you who are*" etc. These first words of Jesus are then directly personal in their application, not general. While in Luke the *poor*<sup>1</sup> plainly stand opposed to the worldly *rich* of verse 24, Matthew, by his modifying phrase *in spirit*, takes away all such reference to a mere lack of material wealth and confers a blessing only upon those who are poor in some higher sense. Jesus doubtless having spoken in the vernacular of the country and not in Greek, this richer meaning of the word "poor," which Luke misses, is to be sought in Hebrew forms of speech (*b*). The mourners, who, in Matthew, are next<sup>2</sup> pronounced blessed, are not those who have lost friends by death, but the same righteous "poor" among the people of Israel, represented by the little band of the disciples of Jesus, who were to be comforted by the coming in of the new kingdom.<sup>3</sup> Matthew's third beatitude, not found in Luke, is, if possible, still more closely related to the first.

<sup>1</sup> *πτωχοί, ptōchōi*.

<sup>2</sup> Some modern editions follow those ancient exemplars which invert the order of verses 4 and 5, thus securing a somewhat more suitable connection of ideas.

<sup>3</sup> See 2 Esd. x., 6 ff., and cp. Hos. x., 5, Am. viii., 8, where the LXX. have the same word for "mourn" which Matthew here uses. Luke has instead a word more expressive of the outward sign of mourning, but it also is a Septuagint term (see Num. xi., 10, xxv., 6). So in the following clause he has, more picturesquely, *laugh* instead of *be comforted*.

The *meek*<sup>1</sup> and the *poor in spirit* are hardly two different classes, but the same class viewed under slightly different aspects. The ground of happiness is the same in both cases, although differently described. Since the kingdom of heaven was to be established upon earth by the restoration of the Holy Land to the children of Israel, citizenship in this kingdom and the inheritance of the land was one and the same thing. The "meek" and gentle, it is said, will come into possession of this land, not those who fight for it with the sword. For the common rendering substitute "they it is who will inherit the land." Luke again, in his second beatitude (Matthew's fourth) gives no hint that his language is to be taken tropically; while Matthew, after strengthening the figure by combining *thirst* with *hunger*, takes them both into the spiritual realm by making righteousness and not food and drink the object of that desire which is sure to be satisfied. The contrast is brought out distinctly: those who long only for the gratification of the bodily appetite may after all go hungry and thirsty, but not *they*<sup>2</sup>—the seekers after the bread of life. In saying that the ones to whom God will be merciful are those who have shown mercy to their fellow-men Jesus is only stating the natural law of retribution, in accordance with which the unmerciful can expect for themselves only justice without favour. If the sixth beatitude had read simply "blessed are the pure," it might have been taken as a commendation of the scrupulousness with which the stricter Jews practised the many ablutions prescribed by their ceremonial law: as it is, the *pure in heart* are those who do not place the purity of the body above the purity of the inner life

<sup>1</sup> *πραεῖς*, *praëis*. *πραῦς* is sometimes used in the Septuagint instead of *πρωχός* to render 'āni and its related 'ānāv. Cp. Ps. xxxvii., 11 (LXX., xxxvi.).

<sup>2</sup> The intensive *αυτοί*, as both before and after. Cp. the words of Jesus to the woman of Samaria in John iv., 14: "He that drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst."

—that life which the bodily organ of the heart is so often used to typify.<sup>1</sup> Later we meet with the reverse of the picture, in the woes denounced against those Pharisees who make haste to “cleanse the outside of the cup and of the platter” while leaving the inside full of corruption.<sup>2</sup> In purity of heart are summed up all the virtues. The reward of the pure life is a vision of the Highest. To *see God* is to come into intimate conscious relation with Him. The figure is derived from the custom of the courts of kings, where only special favourites are admitted to the royal presence. The peace-makers<sup>3</sup> who are declared blessed are not the same as the peaceful or “meek” ones before spoken of, but are those who actively exert themselves to promote peace. To *be called* [*i. e.*, to be]<sup>4</sup> *sons of God* is to sustain to Him an affectionate relation like that of a son to a father. The special Messianic relation by virtue of which *one* became *the* son of God is here expanded into a universal relation from which none are excluded who do not exclude themselves.<sup>5</sup> Matthew’s two concluding beatitudes are blended by Luke into one, which, with some variations of form, is their substantial equivalent. Jesus declares those blessed who endure sufferings and persecutions, if only they suffer on account of their faithfulness to the claims of duty and because they are his disciples (*c*). They, like the “poor in spirit,” will be heirs of the king-

<sup>1</sup> Not only all through the O. T., but in classical Greek from Homer down, *καρδία* (*kardia*), “heart,” is used figuratively to denote especially the affectionous but also thought and emotion.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xxiii., 25-28.

<sup>3</sup> *εἰρηνοποιοί*, *ēirēnōpoiōi*.

<sup>4</sup> See § 5.

<sup>5</sup> The Talmud says, “He who makes peace is called a son of God.” In Rev. xxi., 7, all who overcome evil desires are assured of divine sonship. The *υιοθεσία* or “son-adoption” of the Pauline epistles (Rom. viii., 15, 23, ix., 4; Gal. iv., 5; Eph. i., 5) includes ideas foreign to the simplicity of the conception of divine sonship here presented.

dom. This last beatitude is peculiar in being expanded into an utterance of Messianic enthusiasm. Especially does this appear in Luke, where the phrase *in that day* can have no other reference than to the time of the Messianic judgment. The *reward in heaven* of which the faithful ones are assured is not something to be received by them in a future state of existence, but the reward which is, as it were, laid up for them in heaven, and which the Lord will bring at His appearing.<sup>1</sup> This reward is the inheritance of the kingdom of the heavens already promised—the kingdom of God upon earth. As an immediate consolation the disciples are reminded that by their sufferings they will be brought into companionship with that noble band of true prophets whom their countrymen have in times past persecuted and rejected (*d*). Luke's *Woe unto you* in verses 24–26 is in no sense an imprecation, but simply an exclamation expressive of the misery in store for those who are not worthy of admission into the kingdom of heaven. “Alas for you” would be a more satisfactory rendering of the phrase, at least in this connection.<sup>2</sup> By the “woes” the corresponding beatitudes are brought out into bolder relief. While the poor are the heirs of the kingdom, the rich have all their satisfaction in the present.<sup>3</sup> Those who have abundance now will be destitute in the coming time when those now poor will have no lack. Those who are joyful in their present prosperity will find “that day” to be for them a day of mourning. Those who are praised by all instead of being *persecuted for righteousness’ sake* cannot expect to be admitted to the fellowship of

<sup>1</sup> The idea of Rev. xxii., 12 ; 1 Pet. i., 4 ; Col. i., 5.

<sup>2</sup> Is. v., 8–23, is a true antetype of this passage, but hardly Deut. xxvii., 15–26, to which Holtzmann refers as well. In the former passage but not in the latter the LXX. have *ovai* (*ōuai*), Luke's word rendered “woe” in the E. V. Cp. Matt. xviii., 7 ; Luke xvii., 1.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Matt. vi., 2, 5, 16.



the saints of old ; for they are like the false prophets who were praised only by those who were themselves false,—the underlying thought being that men who do their duty are sure not to meet with the popular approval (*e*).

## NOTES.

(*a*, p. 96) They are also sometimes called “ the macarisms,” *makariōi*\* being the Greek word of which *beati* is the Latin translation. Some have desired to substitute “ happy ” for “ blessed ”; but, although neither term satisfactorily represents the original, the familiar phrase has by long use become imbued with a meaning borne by no other word and coming nearer than any other to expressing the exact thought of Jesus. What of this thought is really missed in the word “ blessed ” is the idea of being “ fortunate ” or “ well-off.” This latter meaning especially inheres in *makarioi* in the first beatitude, where the blessedness of the poor is made to consist in their possession of the riches of the kingdom of heaven. The truth is expressed paradoxically: though poor they are well-off, since they enjoy the heavenly riches.

(*b*, p. 96) The three Hebrew words,† one of which Jesus is likely to have used, denote not simply the poor but the righteous poor, and not merely those who are in pecuniary need but also those who are otherwise suffering,—just as the English word “ poor ” has a wide range of meaning covering almost numberless forms of undesirable condition. The righteous poor are thought of in the Old Testament as being especially under the care of Jehovah. ‡ The New Testament equivalent of this idea is found in the declaration of the beatitude that *theirs is the kingdom of heaven*.

(*c*, p. 98) *For righteousness' sake* (Matthew) and *for the Son of Man's sake* (Luke) are substantially the same thing, as appears from Matthew's employing *for my sake* in his last beati-

\* *μακάριοι*.

† *ʾānāv*, *ʾānī*, and *ʿēbhayōn*. The two latter words repeatedly occur together in Ps. as substantial synonymes, in the sense of “ poor and afflicted.” See xl., 18 (E. V. 17, “ poor and needy ”; LXX., xxxix., 18, *πτωχὸς καὶ πέννης*): lxx., 6 (E. V. 5; LXX., lxix., 6): cix., 22 (LXX., cviii.). In Is. xli., 17, *ēbhayon* (LXX. *πτωχός*) is used to describe the condition of the people of Israel in exile. Cp. xlix., 13.

‡ See Ps. lxxiv., 19.

tude as a substitute for his former expression. *Dikaiōsunē*,\* "righteousness," is that conduct which is pleasing to God: it is "His righteousness" in Matt. vi., 33. Though a very common New Testament word, its use is limited chiefly to the Epistles. Luke's Gospel has it only in i., 75, in the prophetic speech of Zacharias, Mark not at all, and Matthew, apart from the present instance and the one just cited, has it but five times, one of these being the case already met with in iii., 15, in which it is used in the peculiar sense of a religious obligation lying outside of the moral law, and another the revised reading of vi., 1, where it is equivalent to "alms-giving" in the next verse. The three other instances are verses 6 and 20 of this chapter, and xxi., 32. The "righteousness" of the Epistles is something much more complex than that simple obedience to the law of God which Jesus enjoined and made the open door to the kingdom of heaven.† The expressions "on account of me" (Matthew) and "on account of the Son of Man" (Luke)—more exact than "for the sake of"—are equivalent to "because of your relation to me, because you follow me and take me for your teacher."

(*d*, p. 99) Cp. Matt. xxiii., 29-37. Holtzmann finds underlying the details of Luke's 22d verse the language of Is. lxvi., 5, but especially reminiscences of experiences like those spoken of in John ix., 22, xvi., 2; Acts v., 41; 1 Pet. iv., 14, 16. If by *your name* is meant the name "Christian," these cannot have been the exact words of Jesus; for "the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch" long after this time (see Acts xi., 26).

(*e*, p. 100) Why Luke has the "woes" and Matthew not, is a matter of speculation. If genuine utterances of Jesus, and properly placed, it is strange that Matthew should have omitted them, especially if they were a part of the *logia*. If, however, they were spoken upon some other occasion, it is conceivable that they may have been unknown to Matthew. Again, they may have been a free creation in the spirit of Matt. xxiii., 13-31, with some indebtedness also to Is. lxv., 13 ff. There seems to be artificiality and inaptness in their introduction into such a discourse as this, especially if, as Luke's "Woe unto *you*" indicates, an immediate personal application to some of those present is intended.

\* δικαιοσύνη.

† See Cone's *The Gospel and its Earliest Interpretations*, 62 ff., 203 ff.

## § 36. TWO SIMILITUDES.

*Matt. v., 13-16; Luke xiv., 34, 35, xi., 33.*

In likening his disciples to salt<sup>1</sup> Jesus seeks to impress upon them the fact of their responsibility for the spreading of the truth among men both by precept and example. But to teach others the truth they must have it themselves. If *they* are without the savour of godliness, they can save neither themselves nor others. They will be as worthless as the salt which, having lost its virtue, is good for nothing but the very meanest uses. In Luke's *He that hath ears to hear, let him hear*, attention is called to the importance of seriously considering what has just been said. Stripped of its rhetorical form the injunction is "Let him who hears this truth reflect upon it." What, according to later tradition, Jesus said in public of himself<sup>2</sup> he here, according to Matthew, affirms of his disciples, that they are the light of the world.<sup>3</sup> It is not their eminent fitness to enlighten others to which he calls attention, but the obligation which their opportunity imposes upon them to shed abroad the light which they have<sup>4</sup> (*a*).

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 102) The parallelism in this section is not close. Only Matthew makes Jesus declare that his disciples are the salt of the earth and the light of the world, while Mark and Luke,

<sup>1</sup> On the symbolism of salt, see Kalisch on *Leviticus*, pt. i., 109-114; Robinson's *The Evangelists and the Mishna*, 24; Rodrigues, *Les Origines du Sermon de la Montagne*, Appendix 2.

<sup>2</sup> John viii., 12.

<sup>3</sup> In the following verse, as well as in Luke's parallel, *bushel* is an unsatisfactory rendering, as the measure in question (the *mōdiōs*) held only about a peck. The indefinite word "measure" would be better than "bushel."

<sup>4</sup> In our time this teaching has assumed the stereotyped form of "*Noblesse oblige*."

in place of the first simile, have only the general proposition that salt is good. Luke makes the statement concerning salt part of another discourse to a large crowd, while Mark's words stand at the close of a short address of Jesus to his disciples when they were "in the house" at Capernaum. There may be confusion in the Synoptic chronology. or Jesus may have spoken thus concerning salt on two or three different occasions. Luke's passage concerning the lamp stands as part of still another address.

### § 37. GENERAL ATTITUDE OF JESUS TOWARD THE LAW

*Matt. v., 17-20 ; Luke xvi., 17.*

The transition to this section is abrupt. By something which he had previously said or done Jesus must have given the impression that his spirit was iconoclastic and that he was lacking in reverence for the teachings of the Old Testament Scriptures.<sup>1</sup> Always in the world reform is looked upon as destruction by the champions of the old error ; and Jesus had already shown by his teaching concerning sabbath-observance that he could not be counted on to support the traditions of the elders. Here he sets forth the principle of true conservatism—the preservation of the established order of things so long as it has use, and declares his mission to be one of completion and not of destruction. He even adopts as his own almost the exact language in which the rabbis were accustomed to affirm the absolute permanence of the law ; for they were wont to say that not even the smallest letter<sup>2</sup> nor even the smallest part of a letter<sup>3</sup> could be omitted

<sup>1</sup> The law and the prophets here, as in Matt. vii., 12, xxii., 40, together represent the entire O. T. canon. To these the synagogue readings appear to have been limited (see Acts xiii., 15), and to these the apostles appealed as authority for their teachings (see Acts xxviii., 23).

<sup>2</sup> The Hebrew *Yodh* = the Greek *iōta*, from which the English "jot."

<sup>3</sup> "Tittle" represents the Greek *κεραία* (*kēraia*), "a little horn,"

from any word of the law without endangering the safety of the world.<sup>1</sup> By *these least commandments* are meant the comparatively unimportant precepts represented by the jot and tittle. The accusation against the scribes and Pharisees is that they discriminated, even arbitrarily, between commands which were binding and others which they allowed to be disregarded.<sup>2</sup> (*a.*)

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 104) It is possible that the words here ascribed to Jesus have suffered in transmission. Dr. Cone represents the views of not a few critics when he says that "these words cannot be otherwise fairly interpreted than as including the ceremonial precepts; and since it is altogether contrary to the spirit and aim of Jesus to confirm and give permanence to these, it is highly probable that the sayings in question received in the tradition a more Jewish-legalistic expression than he himself could have intended."—*The Gospel and its Earliest Interpretations*, 89.

## § 38. OF MURDER AND THE SPIRIT OF HATE.

*Matt. v., 21-26; Luke xii., 57-59.*

Jesus proceeds to explain in what way his teachings tend to the fulfilment of the law, namely, by demanding obedience

and has reference to the corners of certain Hebrew letters, carelessness in the writing of which might obscure or pervert the sense.

<sup>1</sup> See Edersheim's *Jesus the Messiah*, vol. i., 537, 538.

<sup>2</sup> Yet in the *Proverbs of the Fathers* is this teaching of one of the rabbis: "Be also as careful of the observance of a light precept as of a weighty one"; and the Mishna says: "Run to the light as well as to the weighty commands." The words of Jesus are made specially emphatic by the form of introduction in verse 18, *verily I say unto you*. Excepting in this familiar formula, ἀμὴν (*amēn* = verily) does not occur in the Synoptic Gospels,—for it is not genuine in Matt. vi., 13, and Mark xvi., 20.

to the spirit as well as to the letter of his precepts. For example, the law forbade the taking of human life: he condemns hatred, which not only may issue in crime but is itself a crime as deserving of punishment as those offences of which the courts of the land take cognisance. A still greater offence and one worthy of punishment by the supreme tribunal is the use of opprobrious epithets such as are calculated to leave a sting behind them. The most fearful retribution is due to him who, by calling his brother a "fool," virtually insults him with the charge of atheism.<sup>1</sup> This offence against brotherly love Jesus stigmatises as no less heinous than those sins which God is represented as punishing with the fires of Gehenna. These are mere illustrations of a principle, not a code of penal law. The penalties of the common court, of the supreme court or sanhedrin, and of the "Gehenna of fire" (a) cover all grades of judicial punishment and so serve as fitting measures of the guilt of all manifestations of the spirit of murder.<sup>2</sup> To his condemnation of anger Jesus adds counsel for those who are at variance with their brethren (verses 23, 24). Love to God being inconsistent with hatred toward man,<sup>3</sup> reconciliation should go before worship.<sup>4</sup> The part of the section where Matthew and Luke are parallel (although in Luke the passage has no connection with the Sermon on the Mount) illustrates the theme by depicting the evil consequences likely to result

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Ps. xiv., 1: "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." Both the Greek and the English but imperfectly represent the Hebrew word.

<sup>2</sup> In the Talmud it is said that "to cherish hatred against one's brother is reckoned as great a misdeed as idolatry and murder."

<sup>3</sup> Cp. 1 John iv., 20, 21.

<sup>4</sup> The Talmud says, "Even though the offender should offer in sacrifice all the sheep of Arabia, he will not be exonerated before begging pardon of the one offended." The same sentiment finds expression in another Jewish saying: "The day of expiation is not a day of expiation until you have become reconciled to your neighbour."

from delaying reconciliation. A legal quarrel is made to represent disagreements of all kinds.

#### NOTE.

(*a*, p. 105) The valley of Hinnom (whence "Gehenna") having been desecrated by Moloch worship and also (probably) by fires kept constantly burning for the consumption of offal, it came at length to be to the Jews what Tartarus was to the Greeks and Romans.\*

### § 39. OF ADULTERY AND DIVORCE.

*Matt. v., 27-32; Luke xvi., 18.*

The relations of the sexes furnish two other examples of the need of a higher ethical standard than that established by the letter of the Mosaic law. In teaching that purity is of the heart and that there may be sin in thought as well as in deed Jesus places himself in the rank of those few exalted ethical teachers of his age who insisted that the mind rather than the body is the true man. What Pericles said of a magistrate, that he "ought to keep not only his hands but even his eyes under restraint,"<sup>1</sup> Jesus declares to be a universal rule of right conduct. The *right eye* and the *right hand* are typical of the most ardent passions.<sup>2</sup> Better, says

\* Cp. Mark ix., 47, 48; Matt. xviii., 9.

<sup>1</sup> Cicero, *De Officiis*, i., 40. The Roman moralist (*ibid.*, iii., 8) speaks of those as "altogether wicked and impious who deliberate whether they shall follow that which they see to be virtuous, for in the very hesitation is involved the guilty deed, even though they may not have accomplished it. Therefore, those things are not to be deliberated upon at all in which deliberation itself is a disgrace." Juvenal (*Sat.*, xiii., 209) says that

"He who meditates any wickedness within himself  
Is guilty of the deed."

Matthew's 28th verse has an almost exact verbal counterpart in the Talmud.

<sup>2</sup> The common preference of the right hand, the right eye, and the

Jesus, that an appetite which cannot be restrained within due bounds should be entirely suppressed than that by its indulgence one should suffer untold harm. To be "cast into Gehenna" or to "go away into Gehenna" is the same as to *perish*, although the former expression calls up to the mind the scene of the impending Messianic judgment.<sup>1</sup> Deut. xxiv., 1, contains the Mosaic law of divorce quoted (though not verbally and only in part) by Jesus. Thus far he has endorsed and even strengthened the law of the Old Covenant : in the case in hand he restricts its application. Understanding the law, as did many of the rabbis, to allow the separation of husband and wife for any cause, at the pleasure of the husband,<sup>2</sup> he adopts the stricter view, that only unfaithfulness, which is itself a virtual dissolution of the marriage bond, is a sufficient cause for divorce. He even goes beyond this and declares (if we take the reports of Matthew and Luke together) that, in case of a divorce for any but the one imperative cause, any subsequent marriage of either party or to either party is a sin. To such a second unholy union a man exposed his wife by divorcing her for an insufficient reason.<sup>3</sup>

right foot above the left, was fully shared by the Jews. See Ex. xxix., 20 ; 1 Sam. xi., 2 ; Zech. xi., 17.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Matt. xviii., 8, 9 ; Mark ix., 43-48, and this passage from Cicero's *Philosophical Orations*, viii., 5, 15 : "If there is anything in the body in such a condition as to harm the rest of the body, we allow it to be burned or cut out, so that some one member may perish rather than the whole body."

<sup>2</sup> Some claimed that a man had a right to divorce his wife if, for any reason, however slight, he became dissatisfied with her, or if he simply preferred someone else. On the other hand, one of the Talmudists declares that "divorce of one's wife is a hateful thing : at the divorce of a first wife even the very altar sheds tears."

<sup>3</sup> On a subsequent occasion this whole subject was treated by Jesus with greater fulness. See Matt. xix., 3 ff. ; Mark x., 2 ff. Concerning the "*get*," or "bill of divorce," see Amram, *The Jewish Law of Divorce*, 132 ff.



## § 40. OF OATHS.

*Matt. v., 33-37.*

A fourth illustration of the position of Jesus with regard to the law is found in his teaching concerning oaths.<sup>1</sup> The substance of the injunction to the faithful performance of an oath, to which he first refers, appears in three books of the Pentateuch<sup>2</sup> (*a*). Many of the rabbis held that only oaths containing the name of the Deity were binding. Jesus declares that, since God is everywhere,<sup>3</sup> to swear either by the heavens above or by the earth beneath is to call the Lord of heaven and earth to witness to one's vow. To swear by Jerusalem was to invoke the Deity, since this was the city of Jehovah *the great King*<sup>4</sup>. The reason given for not swearing by one's head—both a Jewish and a heathen form of oath—is of a different kind, depending upon the futility and meaninglessness of such oaths. Since one has no such power over his head as to be able to make even a single black hair white or a white hair black, how absurd to pretend to give strength to an asseveration by appealing to one's head! Not only the Old Testament but especially the Talmuds and Josephus furnish ample evidence of the prevalence of profanity among the Jews. The spirit of the teaching of Jesus is that the truth is not strengthened by any form of exaggerated speech. It is not probable that Jesus meant to declare (verse 37) that everything beyond downright simplicity of speech comes from the devil, as the text

<sup>1</sup> Cp. with the present section Matt. xxiii., 16-22.

<sup>2</sup> Num. xxx., 2 ff.; Deut. xxiii., 21-23; Lev. xix., 12. Cp. Eccus. xxiii., 9-13.

<sup>3</sup> "Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool."—Is. lxvi., 1.

<sup>4</sup> The Psalmist (xlviii., 2, 8) calls Jerusalem "the city of the great King," "the city of the Lord of hosts," "the city of our God." Cp. Tob., xiii., 15.

of the Revised Version implies. The neuter marginal rendering *evil* is to be preferred.<sup>1</sup>

#### NOTE.

(a, p. 108) The fact that Jesus when on trial allowed himself to be put upon oath by the high-priest \* has no bearing upon the exegesis of the present passage, which clearly states that in his teaching he discountenanced all oaths. It appears, nevertheless, from the forms of swearing of which he speaks, that he had especially in mind the prevalent custom of using such oaths in the ordinary intercourse of life, and that he was not thinking of judicial oaths, although his injunction *swear not at all* taken strictly condemns even these.

#### § 41. OF RETALIATION.

*Matt. v., 38-42, Luke vi., 29, 30.*

A fifth instance of a higher law. The saying which Jesus quotes<sup>2</sup> is part of a passage in which the duties of the magistrate with regard to the imposition of penalties are minutely defined. The *lex talionis*, or "law of like," which visited upon the offender the same suffering or loss which he had inflicted upon another, was the embodiment of the leading principle of Israelitish justice. Even in the theodicy of Paul there still remains a trace of the influence of this pre-Christian doctrine.<sup>3</sup> What the Jewish lawgiver intended only as a guide to the judge had come to be looked upon as an authorisation of private retaliation in kind. The injunction of Jesus neither to oppose force to force nor to enter into litigation with anyone receives striking additions in the advice to

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Rom. xii., 9: "*Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good.*"

\* See Matt. xxvi., 63, 64.

<sup>2</sup> From Ex. xxi., 24.

<sup>3</sup> See 2 Thess. i., 6.

yield cheerfully even to troublesome demands upon one's time and means.<sup>1</sup> The conditions of the times determined the form of this advice to the first disciples. The law allowed only one of the two garments which were usually worn<sup>2</sup> to be taken as a pledge for the payment of a debt. Officers of the law and especially couriers on the king's business might impress into their service both men and beasts.

### § 42. OF LOVING ONE'S ENEMIES.

*Matt. v., 43-48; Luke vi., 27, 28, 32-36.*

The Old Testament enjoins love of one's neighbour, but not hatred of one's enemy<sup>3</sup>: the second part of the saying quoted by Jesus must then have had some other source, so that this is not strictly a sixth example of his improvement upon the teaching of the elder Scripture, but only a correction of its false interpretation. His injunction to love one's enemies is not, however, without some Old Testament support.<sup>4</sup> In the Talmuds there are approximate parallels<sup>5</sup>; and the Roman Seneca, in the very spirit of Jesus and even in words suggesting his, makes the impartial bestowing of the divine blessings an example of what the heavenly Father desires of

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Lev. xix., 18; Prov. xxiv., 29; Is. l., 6; Ecclus. xxix.; and see Meuschen's *N. T. ex Talmude illustratum*, 488-568; Robinson's *The Evangelists and the Mishna*, 36.

<sup>2</sup> The *chitôn*, the under-garment or tunic (E. V. "coat"), and the *himatiôn*, the outer-garment (E. V. "cloak").

<sup>3</sup> Lev. xix., 18. The declaration of the Psalmist in cxxxix., 21, 22, is no real exception, being little more than a strong expression of loyalty to Jehovah, justified by Deut. xxxii., 41.

<sup>4</sup> See Prov. xxiv., 17, xxv., 21; Job xxxi., 29; Ecclus. viii., 7.

<sup>5</sup> "It is not the wicked whom we ought to hate; it is wickedness." "We ought not to desire the misfortune of an enemy, neither rejoice at his fall." Rejoicing over the destruction of the Egyptians in the Red Sea is condemned.

His children.<sup>1</sup> In enjoining love of one's enemies Jesus is not commanding the impossible, namely, the deliberate fixing of one's affections upon a given object, but simply the cherishing of a friendly feeling for those who have not manifested friendship toward us<sup>2</sup> (a).

## NOTE.

(a, p. 111) Although Luke has a third more matter than Matthew in this section, it is the thought of verse 34 alone which is peculiar to him, and even this is but a development of what Matthew has in verse 42 of the preceding section. Where their forms of expression vary, they generally use substantially synonymous phrases. Thus where Matthew has "persecute" (verse 44) Luke has (verse 28) a verb,\* rarely found in the New Testament, meaning to "revile" or "insult" (English Version, *despitefully use*). † Once (verse 35) Luke agrees with Matthew in the use of *misthos*, "reward," but elsewhere he repeatedly has *charis*, which calls attention to the "thankfulness" (English Version, *thank*) of the recipient of a favour rather than to any other reward received by him who confers it. Where in Matthew (verse 48) perfection (after the measure of man's possibility) is enjoined, Luke makes Jesus to have demanded only mercifulness.

## § 43. OF ALMSGIVING.

*Matt. vi., 1-4.*

From the ancient law and its misinterpretations Jesus passes to a consideration of the religious usages of his own

<sup>1</sup> "If thou wouldst imitate the gods, confer favours even upon the ungrateful; for the sun rises even upon the wicked, and the seas are open to pirates."—*De Benef.*, iv., 26.

<sup>2</sup> That one of the two N. T. Greek verbs meaning "love" which is here used (*ἀγαπάω*) has the meaning above given in distinction from the signification of *φιλέω*, the more common word for "love" in the sense of "strong affection." See Thayer, under *φιλέω*.

\* *ἐπιρροεῖω*.

† In the T. R. Matthew has both words.

time, in both the form and the spirit of which he finds much to condemn. In the first place he enjoins freedom from ostentation in the bestowal of charity,—this in contrast with the too prevalent custom of making a display of one's generosity<sup>1</sup> (*a.*) The injunction not to sound a trumpet as the hypocrites<sup>2</sup> do when about to give alms is to be understood figuratively, in accordance with frequent Old Testament usage. The trumpet was used to call together the assemblies of the Jewish people. Jesus declares that these ostentatious givers have for their only reward the notoriety which their public giving brings to them.<sup>3</sup>

## NOTE.

(*a.*, p. 112) The prominent place assigned to the relief of the poor as a religious duty in the time of Jesus appears from the fact that, in all the best texts of this passage, "righteousness" (*dikaiōsunē*) is found in verse 1 as a synonyme of "alms" (*ēlēēmōsunē*) in the next verse. In the LXX. the two terms are treated as though very closely related.\* Nevertheless this special use of *dikaiōsunē* occurs in the New Testament only in the present passage, and, with the exception of a single instance,† Matthew alone of the Synoptic writers

<sup>1</sup> Cp. the three following passages from widely different sources: "Rabbi Jannai saw some one giving money openly to a poor man and said to him, 'It were better not to have given at all than to have given in such a way.'"—*The Babylonian Talmud*. "To me indeed everything seems more praiseworthy which is not blazoned abroad or done in the sight of the people."—Cicero's *Tusc. Quæst.*, ii., 26. "Do good and do not speak of it, and assuredly thy kindness will be recompensed to thee."—Sadi's *Gulistan*. Other illustrative passages may be found in Robinson's *The Evangelists and the Mishna*, pp. 39, 40.

<sup>2</sup> "Hypocrite" is from the common Greek word for "play-actor."

<sup>3</sup> On the verb translated *have received* (ἀπέχουσιν, *apēchōusin*) see the Greek lexicons of Liddell and Scott, Sophocles, Thayer, and Schleussner, and Meyer's *Kritischexegetisches Kommentar* on Phil. iv., 18.

\* See Tob. ii., 14, xii., 8, 9, xiv., 10, 11. Cp. 2 Cor. ix., 9; Acts x., 2.

† Luke i., 75.

employs it in any sense. It is a term almost peculiar to the Epistles, where it appears constantly.\* Matthew's peculiar expression "to do alms" is from the Septuagint. †

§ 44. OF PRAYER.

*Matt. vi., 5-8.*

Among the stricter Jews there was much ostentation in prayer as well as in alms-giving. When thus praying, long pauses were sometimes made both before and after the prayer, in order to attract attention ; and the praying posture is said to have been not unfrequently maintained for three consecutive hours. The privacy of one's home,<sup>1</sup> says Jesus, is the place for prayer. Of the various explanations of the origin and meaning of the rare verb<sup>2</sup> rendered in the English Version *use vain repetitions*,<sup>3</sup> that is the best which derives it from an attempt to describe stammering by a single onomatopoeic word. "Babble"<sup>4</sup> is its nearest English equivalent.<sup>5</sup>

\* For the various meanings of the word see Cremer's *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of N. T. Greek*.

† Tob. xii., 8.

<sup>1</sup> *ταμειον* (*tamēion*), "inner chamber" (A. V. "closet"), here a retired room of any kind ; in classical Greek and in Luke xii., 24, a "barn" or "storehouse" ; in the LXX. used in both senses.

<sup>2</sup> *βαττολογέω*.

<sup>3</sup> For Biblical instances of "vain repetition" in prayer by heathens see 1 Kings xviii., 26 ; Acts xix., 34.

<sup>4</sup> Many languages have a similar word to describe inarticulate and senseless utterance.

<sup>5</sup> The teaching of the rabbis with regard to the value of iteration in prayer was various. One Talmudic passage declares that "every one who multiplies prayer is heard." On the other hand, in Ecclus. vii., 14, is the injunction, "Repeat not thy words in thy prayer." Cp. the *Heautontimoroumenos* of Terence, v., i., 6.

## § 45. THE LORD'S PRAYER.

*Matt. vi., 9-15; Luke xi., 1-4.*

What we call "the Lord's Prayer"—the *Pater Noster* of the Roman Catholic Church—stands in Matthew as an example of a form of petition not burdened with the "vain repetition" which Jesus has just condemned. In Luke it is better introduced as given upon another occasion in answer to the request of one of the disciples that their master would teach them to pray. Luke's form is more concise than that of Matthew (*a*), as is shown by the following parallel arrangement of the clauses :

MATTHEW.	LUKE.
Our father who art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done as in heaven so on earth.	Father, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come.
Give us this day our daily bread.	Give us day by day our daily bread.
And forgive us our debts as we also have forgiven our debtors.	And forgive us our sins ; for we ourselves forgive every one who is indebted to us.
And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.	And bring us not into temptation.

The entire omission of the doxology from both texts is in accordance with the testimony of all the best MSS. and critical editions. The prayer may be resolved into an invocation (simple in Luke, but complex in Matthew) followed by five<sup>1</sup> distinct petitions (*b*). The conception of the fatherhood of God, with which the New Testament is so saturated as to be thereby differentiated from all earlier religious

<sup>1</sup> By dividing the second and fifth the number in Matthew may be extended to seven.

literature, is not an original contribution of Christianity to the world's thought, but only the full flowering of an idea the germ of which had already taken root centuries before among many peoples. In the Old Testament, outside of the Apocrypha, the word "father" is seldom applied to the Deity. Moses, in his song before the assembly of Israel, asks the people reproachfully, in view of their sins, if Jehovah is not their father who has adopted them ; and afterwards he speaks of them as the children of Jehovah.<sup>1</sup> Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Malachi also call Jehovah the father of His people.<sup>2</sup> The apocryphal books, by the greater frequency of their reference to God as a father,<sup>3</sup> show that among the people of Israel the way is gradually preparing for that ascendancy of the paternal over the monarchical conception of the Deity which characterises the new dispensation. But the idea of the fatherhood of God is Japhetic as well as Shemitic and early impressed itself upon Indo Germanic speech, and through this upon the oldest religious literature of the Aryan stock (*c*). In Hebrew thought, name and person were one : hence in *hallowed be thy name* the petition is for the growth in men's hearts of reverence for the Divine Being.<sup>4</sup> The prayer for the coming of the *kingdom* or "reign" of God is a natural development from the previous petition ; and the following words, which are absent from Luke, only bring out into clearer light the full content of the main idea of the sovereignty of God.<sup>5</sup> From the

<sup>1</sup> Deut. xxxii., 6, 18-20.

<sup>2</sup> Is. lxiii., 16, lxiv., 8 ; Jer. iii., 4, 19, xxxi., 9 ; Mal. i., 6, ii., 10.

<sup>3</sup> See Tob. xiii., 4 ; Wisd. ii., 13, 16, 18, xiv., 3 ; Eccclus. xxiii., 1, 4, li., 10 ; 3 Mac. vi., 3.

<sup>4</sup> In view of Is. xxix., 23, "They shall sanctify my name ; yea, they shall sanctify the Holy One of Jacob, and shall stand in awe of the God of Israel," it can hardly be conceded to Dr. Plummer that "it ['thy name'] is not a mere paraphrase for God."

<sup>5</sup> See § 14 (*d*). The Babylonian Talmud says that "that prayer wherein is no mention of the kingdom of God is no prayer."



expression of the spirit of worship and of the hope that God's will may speedily be done among men as it is done among the inhabitants of heaven<sup>1</sup> the transition is easy to the thought of human need and the divine bounty which supplies it. If by "prayer" is to be understood the asking for personal favours, then all that has gone before is but preliminary aspiration, as some critics<sup>2</sup> consider it (*d*). The next petition is in harmony with the spirit of the previous teaching<sup>3</sup> concerning reconciliation (*e*). From very early times even to the present the prayer *bring us not into temptation* has been a stumbling-block to many because of its supposed implication that God tempts men to do wrong. Doubtless the form of expression savours of the Jewish conception of the Deity as the controller of all human conditions and therefore of those which in their nature offer inducements to sin; but this doctrine was not held in any such way as to relieve men of personal responsibility for their acts. The apostle Paul, while inheriting this notion from his Jewish training, assures his Christian converts that God "will with the temptation make also the way of escape,"<sup>4</sup> thus encouraging them in well-doing. What Matthew adds here to Luke's formula is in the spirit of the Hebrew poetical parallelism, although it is rather a completion than a repetition of the previous appeal. As before,<sup>5</sup> *evil* is to be preferred to *the evil one* of the text of the Revised Version (*f*). The doxology may be an echo from 1 Chron. xxix., 11. It was doubtless from its use in church liturgies that it crept into some MSS. of the New Testament text.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Ps. ciii., 21.

<sup>2</sup> See Haane, in *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, xi., 507 ff., and in Schenkel's *Bibel-Lexikon*.

<sup>3</sup> See § 38.

<sup>4</sup> 1 Cor. x., 13.

<sup>5</sup> § 40, which see.

<sup>6</sup> In the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, which has the Lord's

The "Lord's Prayer" is wrongly apprehended by those who think of it as an altogether original creation not only dissociated from but at variance with the customary forms of petition in use among the Jews in the time of Jesus. So far is this from being the case that it would be nearer to the truth to say that it is for the most part based upon forms with which the Jews of the first century were altogether familiar.<sup>1</sup> Its originality consists in its ideal comprehensiveness and brevity, nothing being omitted, and, in Luke's more nearly primitive form, nothing repeated.

Although nothing is likely to have been farther from the thought of Jesus than the giving of a fixed form of prayer to his disciples, the "Lord's Prayer" must have very early come to be cherished as a precious legacy and so to have its form fixed beyond the chances of serious corruption. This is plainly indicated by the fact that the text has been preserved with so few variations in the best MSS. of the Gospels

Prayer almost exactly in Matthew's form, the doxology is present and reads "for thine is the power and the glory forever." On the N. T. text of the doxology see Immer's *Hermeneutics*, 110; Tisch., *N. T. Græce*, ed. 8va critica major, i., 26.

<sup>1</sup> These prayers are still in existence and in common use among the Jews at the present day. From them almost every sentence of the Lord's Prayer can be paralleled. In view of this fact, so cautious a critic as Dr. Immer declares that "lively echoes of familiar prayers would so naturally suggest themselves to our Lord, and any reason for rejecting them was so entirely wanting, that the absence of such popular consecrated echoes, extending to the very words, would even have been matter for surprise." In the common Jewish service-book one of the most frequent forms of address to the Deity is "Our Father." In one part of the morning service forty-four consecutive petitions are introduced with the words "Our Father and our king!" Elsewhere the form of address is "Heavenly Father!" Other phrases are "May his hallowed name be praised," "Lead us not into the power of sin, transgression, iniquity, temptation or contempt but remove far from us evil men and wicked associations and works." There are numerous passages resembling the doxology.

that, from the very beginning of modern textual criticism, it was fixed in every particular almost beyond dispute. From Griesbach (1774) to the present day editors have changed hardly more than a single word, and between the text of Tischendorf (1869) and that of the very latest editors there is no difference whatever.

#### NOTES.

(*a*, p. 114) Which of the two better represents the actual words of Jesus is a matter of dispute. It is even possible that the form may have been given by Jesus somewhat differently upon two different occasions. Assuming what is altogether more probable, that his free spirit would not twice have expressed itself in so nearly the same form of petition, the preference as to originality is to be given to Luke, whose terse phraseology Matthew weakens by expanding. Supposing Matthew to have preserved the very words of Jesus, it is not conceivable that Luke should have known only of a mutilated form. The natural tendency of frequent repetition is to expansion, not contraction. The difficulty of supposing that Jesus twice gave essentially the same form of prayer is clearly stated by Meyer, who urges that, if Matthew's chronology is correct, the later request for help to pray, recorded by Luke, cannot be historical, while, if this request was made at a comparatively late date, the disciples could not have been given the prayer at the time of the delivery of the Sermon on the Mount. It is simpler to suppose a mere misplacement by Matthew than the insertion of an altogether unhistorical incident by Luke.

(*b*, p. 114) The invocation in Matthew is not strengthened by the addition of *our* and *which art in heaven*. Luke's one word *Father* comprehends all. It is a needless multiplication of words and a dilution instead of an enrichment of the thought to make explicit the idea first of one's sonship and then of heavenly as distinguished from earthly parentage. The suggestion has been made, not without reason, that the addition of "our" was due to a Jewish-Christian regard for the rabbinical injunction that men should not pray as individuals but as if members of a congregation, that is, that they should say *we* and not *I*. Besides, Matthew throughout

his Gospel\* speaks of God as the "heavenly father" or the "father who is in heaven"—a phrase almost never employed elsewhere, † while "father" alone is constantly used throughout the New Testament—being absent from no book excepting the one brief chapter of 3 John. It would seem that only the idiosyncrasy of a reviser can account for Matthew's monopoly of this expression.

(c, p. 115) In the Hindu *Rig-Veda*, which is probably more than a thousand years older than the New Testament, the Supreme Deity is addressed as *Dyaus-pitar* or "heaven-father," whence the Greek *Zeus pater* and the Roman *Jupiter*. ‡ Since to speak of God as a parent is to borrow a term properly expressive only of a human relation, the phrase "heavenly father" is subject to all the diversities of meaning which, in various ages and countries, attach to the conception of ideal fatherhood. Between the dissolute "father Zeus" of the Greeks and the "father in heaven" of the New Testament the gulf is so great as to be almost impassable. Neither did the Roman who addressed Jupiter as *optime et maxime*, "best and greatest," mean by the "best" most holy, but only most free to act his own pleasure.

(d, p. 116) That there is here a petition for *daily* bread is not altogether certain, as the margin of the Revised Version shows. The word translated "daily" is found nowhere else in the New Testament, neither does it occur in any earlier literature. Its etymology being uncertain and its meaning not being determinable from the connection, there has been much guessing as to its signification. All the following translations have been given: *daily, for the coming day, to-morrow's, continual, future, that cometh, needful, necessary, essential, sufficient, permanent, excellent, surpassing, abundant, supernatural, supersubstantial, consubstantial.* §

\* v., 16, 45, 48, vi., 1, 14, 26, 32, vii., 11, 21, x., 32, 33, xii., 50, xv., 13, xvi., 17, xviii., 10, 14, 19, 35, xxiii., 9.

† Luke xi., 13, furnishes one instance.

‡ "Zeus is the same word as Dyaus in Sanscrit, Jovis or Ju in *Jupiter* in Latin, Tiw in Anglo-Saxon, preserved in Tiwsdaeg, Tuesday, the day of the Eddic god Tyr; Zio in Old High-German."—Max Müller, *Science of Language*.

§ See Dr. Plummer's notes, *International Critical Commentary* on Luke, 295, 296; Lightfoot, *On a Fresh Revision of the English N. T.*,

(c, p. 116) In this petition *sins* in Luke is an interpretation of *debts* (the latter word perhaps occurring in Luke's source as in Matthew), for which it appears to have been substituted. Notwithstanding this change, the following verb (which means to "remit" a debt and not to "forgive" in the broader sense) still stands as a sign that the change has taken place. To "have remitted" in Matthew and "remit" in Luke is to be added a Syriac future reading, "will remit." Taking this passage in connection with Matthew's supplementary 14th and 15th verses we seem to hear an echo of Eccus. xxviii., 2: "Forgive thy neighbour the hurt that he hath done unto thee; so shall thy sins also be forgiven when thou prayest." \*

(f, p. 116) Cremer maintains that "against the rendering which would take τοῦ πονηροῦ (*tōu pōnērōu*) as the genitive of the masculine it is enough to say that there is no reason nor pretext in the context for making this possible rendering necessary," adding that "the thought which suggests this possible rendering is foreign to the character of the prayer"; and he agrees with Stier in thinking that the incongruity becomes apparent when we substitute "the devil" for "the evil one." So substantially Alford.

## § 46. ON FASTING.

*Matt. vi., 16-18.*

As has already been seen in § 27, the views of Jesus concerning fasting were not those commonly held by his countrymen. Here his position is made still plainer. Those fasts in which outward signs of sorrow are ostentatiously displayed he altogether condemns. Since under the influence of powerful emotions the usual care of the person is apt to be neglected, the "hypocrites," illogically inverting

App. i., 163-180; Cremer's *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of the N. T. Greek*, 221-224; Meyer's *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew*, I., 207-210; Keim's *History of Jesus of Nazara*, III., 340, 341.

\* Cp. Mark x1., 25.

the proper relation of ideas, thought by cultivating slovenliness to become religious. The reference here may be either to private fasts regulated by the individual or to the public fasts prescribed for the whole people. The disfigurement of the face spoken of<sup>1</sup> was produced not only by leaving it unwashed and the hair and beard uncombed but also by placing ashes upon the head. Jesus condemns this neglect and even pollution of the body, and enjoins that, whether in the spirit of fasting or not, his disciples shall not make unsightly spectacles of themselves for the purpose of attracting attention, but shall under all circumstances observe the decencies of life.<sup>2</sup>

#### § 47. OF EARTHLY AND HEAVENLY TREASURE.

*Matt. vi., 19-21, Luke xii., 33, 34.*

The parallelism between Matthew and Luke is not close excepting in the last sentence. "Treasure not up for yourselves treasures" is the exact equivalent of Matthew's first words. *Rust* is not the full equivalent of the Greek word<sup>3</sup> which it is used to translate, which properly signifies "eating"; but as the reference here is probably to the rusting of alloyed money, the correct meaning is conveyed by the

<sup>1</sup> In the Greek there is a paronomasia which can be only imperfectly preserved in English. It is something like this: "they make their faces *unsightly* that they may be *seen* by men to fast." The Babylonian Talmud tells us that "in the public fasts everyone took ashes and put upon his head." Again: "Why is his name called Ashur [*i. e.*, 'black']? Because his face was black by fastings." It is told of Rabbi ben Ananiah that "all the days of his life his face was black by reason of his fastings."

<sup>2</sup> The anointing of the head was a regular part of the Jewish toilet. See Deut. xxviii., 40; 2 Sam. xii., 20, xiv., 2; Ps. xxiii., 5; Dan. x., 3; Ruth iii., 3. Cp. Mark xiv., 3; Luke vii., 46.

<sup>3</sup> βρωσις, *brōsis*.

present translation. The *moth* spoken of is the clothes-moth.<sup>1</sup> Money and garments constituted the chief treasures of the ancients. In making thieves *dig* through rather than *break* into houses regard is had to the usual structure of Oriental dwellings, the walls of which are very loosely built.<sup>2</sup> It is only the peculiarity of the Hebrew idiom which makes Jesus *seem* to speak against the laying up of wealth. Strong emphasis upon the superior value of the heavenly riches is secured by representing earthly treasure as of no value. This is merely one form of Oriental hyperbole. In Luke the injunction to sell their possessions and give to the poor occurs in connection with other instructions of Jesus to his disciples concerning riches, and only looks to the conditions in which they then found themselves. There is no reason whatever for supposing that he intended to lay down a binding precept for all men and for all time.<sup>3</sup>

#### § 48. ON THE INNER LIGHT.

*Matt. vi., 22, 23 ; Luke xi., 34-36.*

The figurative language here used is not to be too closely pressed. The eye is the lamp of the body, not as itself giving light but only as furnishing the necessary conditions for the reception of light.<sup>4</sup> So the inner light or eye of the soul is rather a channel of divine truth than its source. As a sound and healthy eye is essential to the clear vision of material

<sup>1</sup> Mentioned nowhere else in the N. T.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Ezek. xii., 5, 7, 12 ; Job xxiv., 16.

<sup>3</sup> See Rodrigues, *Orig. du Sermon de la Montagne*, App., Note x., for a passage from the Talmud concerning earthly and heavenly treasure.

<sup>4</sup> Philo, contemporary with Jesus, wrote : " What intelligence (*nous*) is in the soul, that the eye is in the body," and Plato had long before spoken of " the eye of the soul." The author of Prov. xx., 27, declares that " the spirit of man is the lamp [LXX. *φῶς*] of the Lord."

things, lacking which the body is, as it were, in darkness, still more true is it that, when the light of the spirit is obscured, man is plunged into the profoundest gloom. "See to it, then, that the light which is in you is not darkness" (Luke) is a caution against the neglect or perversion of one's nobler powers.<sup>1</sup>

## § 49. OF SERVING TWO MASTERS.

*Matt. vi., 24 ; Luke xvi., 13.*

The impossibility of one's having two ruling passions is here set forth in concrete terms. One must choose between serving God and not serving Him : no middle course is possible. *Mammon* is a Syro-Chaldaic word of somewhat uncertain origin<sup>2</sup> meaning "riches," and, in rabbinical usage, "devotion to riches." As here used, "Mammon" is the personification of this idea and corresponds to the Greek *Ploutos*. The reason given for the impossibility of a divided service is stated in alternative propositions which are substantially but not exactly identical. Of the two the former is the stronger. "He will hate the one and love the other, or, at the very least, he will attach himself closely to the one and think slightly of the other" (*a*).

### NOTE.

(*a*, p. 123) The fact that the texts of Matthew and Luke are identical, excepting that the latter supplies the word "servant," which adds nothing to the sense, makes it altogether probable that both borrowed from a common source.

<sup>1</sup> Luke's 36th verse adds nothing to the thought of verse 34, of which it appears to be a weak repetition out of place. It is not unlikely that Jesus used such language upon different occasions.

<sup>2</sup> According to one derivation it should signify "what is trusted in"; according to another, "treasure." In the N. T. it occurs only here and in § 129.



This, however, implies a faulty arrangement on the part of one or the other. In Luke the passage immediately follows the parable of the unjust steward, with the subject of which it has a rather remote connection: in Matthew it stands in a fitting though not immediate relation to the teaching of § 47 concerning earthly and heavenly riches.

### § 50. OF AVARICE.

*Luke xii., 13-21.*

This passage from Luke's account of the last journey of Jesus to Jerusalem is closely related in its subject to §§ 47 and 49. Someone out of the large crowd which Jesus is addressing is so stupid as to suppose that he can use him for his own selfish ends. As a means of conciliating his goodwill he seeks to flatter him with recognition of him as a rabbi.<sup>1</sup> Jesus replies with a term which, under the circumstances, comes little short of expressing contempt, like the English "fellow."<sup>2</sup> The following parable represents in pictorial form the folly of dependence upon riches.<sup>3</sup>

### § 51. OF THOUGHT FOR BODILY NEEDS.

*Matt. vi., 25-34; Luke xii., 22-32.*

It follows that, if heavenly rather than earthly treasure is to be sought after by the disciples of Jesus (and Luke now represents him as speaking to them and not to the multitude), it behooves them to concentrate their thoughts upon this and to trust to the divine providence for the supply of

<sup>1</sup> The Greek διδάσκαλε (*didaskalē*) = "teacher," here used, is not the full equivalent of *rabbi*, which signifies "my great one."

<sup>2</sup> "Man" is here ἄνθρωπος, not ἀνὴρ.

<sup>3</sup> The same lesson is taught in Ecclus. xi., 18, 19, excepting that there the rich man gets his wealth by "wariness and pinching," and not from legitimate husbandry.

their temporal needs.<sup>1</sup> The connection indicates that what Jesus meant was, not that they should neglect to provide for their daily wants, and not even that they should not be over-anxious with regard to the future, but that they should do as the birds do, take that which the bounty of nature offers and which is sufficient for all real needs, not wasting their energies in exhausting efforts to procure the means of gratifying a luxurious taste. Simplicity and naturalness of life, not idleness and mendicancy, are commended, and what is especially condemned is the making the pampering of the body the chief end of existence (*a*). Emphasis is given to this teaching by the appeal of Jesus to his auditors to say whether it is possible for them by any effort to add to the length of their lives (*b*.) If Jesus, when referring to the *lilies of the field*, had in mind some special flower of remarkable beauty, the most that can now be said is that it *may* have been the purple-tinged white lily which grows in Palestine to-day. By the *glory* of Solomon is meant his kingly state in general but particularly the splendour of the royal apparel.<sup>2</sup> When the lilies are referred to as *grass*, this now limited word is used in its comprehensive Early English sense, which included all herbage.<sup>3</sup> The scarcity of fuel in the Orient makes

<sup>1</sup> The main theme of this section receives illustration from Prov. x., 3; Ps. xxxiv., 10, xxxvii., 5, lv., 22. With the teaching concerning the birds and the lilies compare the words of Rabbi Simon ben Eleazar: "Hast thou ever seen a beast or a bird that followed a trade? Yet they are fed without toil." Cp. Ps. civ., 27. It is almost a peculiarity of Hebrew literature not to speak of animals and plants without mentioning their habitat. For instances see Gen. i., 26; Ps. viii., 8, civ., 12. Instances of this usage are occasionally found even in classical Greek.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Chron. ix. describes some of the glories of the reign of Solomon. It is only in later Hebraistic Greek that δόξα, "glory," denotes external splendour, and not merely reputation or renown.

<sup>3</sup> In this sense it is the exact equivalent of χόπος (*chörtös*) = the Latin *hortus*.

it necessary to use for this purpose all kinds of refuse vegetation. The injunction preserved only by Luke (verse 29), *neither be ye of doubtful mind*, is of uncertain significance, but is probably directed against worldly anxiety of all kinds. Under the term *Gentiles* are included all non-Jews.<sup>1</sup> Luke's last verse is very loosely connected with what has preceded. It is an assurance to the little band of disciples that they will inherit the kingdom of heaven if they prove themselves worthy of it.

## NOTES.

(a, p. 125) When King James's translators in 1611 rendered *mē mērimnatē*\* "take no thought for," they meant just what the Revisers of 1881 intended by their rendering *be not anxious for*. "Thought" was a word of more serious meaning then than now, as a few illustrations from the literature of that period will make evident. Lord Bacon says that "one Harris, an alderman in London, was put to trouble, and died of thought and anxiety before his business came to an end." In the Somers tracts it is said that Queen Catharine Parr died "of thought." A translation of Ammianus Marcellinus made in 1609 says of the Emperor Tacitus that "his heart was broken, and so for thought he died." The same usage is found in Shakespeare. The Revisers therefore simply modernise the Authorised Version in substituting "be not anxious" for "take no thought." But while the old rendering may now be somewhat misleading, because of the weakened meaning of the word "thought," it is possible that the new phrase "be not anxious" goes as much too far in the other direction. The Greek verb sometimes signifies merely "to exercise care for," "to give thought to," "to make a business of doing" something;

<sup>1</sup> See Luke ii., 32, where the Gentiles and the people of Israel constitute "all peoples." It is unfortunate that this word has ever been used to translate ἔθνη (*ethnē*), since often, as here in Luke, no rendering but "nations" is suitable. For the various meanings of ἔθνος see the N. T. lexicons of Thayer, Robinson, and Cremer.

\* μὴ μεριμνᾶτε.

and this group of meanings seems fully adequate to the expression of the idea in the present passage.

(*b*, p. 125) *Hēlikia*,\* once before met with,† occurs, in all, eight times in the New Testament. In three of these instances‡ it is translated in the English Version “age,” in the other cases “stature.”§ The double meaning of the word being thus recognised, it remains to determine which is the proper rendering in the present passage. The only conceivable objection to the translation “age,” is the seeming impropriety of using the cubit, which is a standard of length, as a measure of time : but besides the general fact that men constantly speak of time as long or short,|| the Greek poet Mimnermus uses the very expression “a cubit of time” to denote the brief period of the joys of youth.¶ From Luke’s 26th verse it appears that the cubit was meant by Jesus to represent a very little thing, which, of course, as an addition to the height of a man, it would not be,\*\* while, as compared with the other more common measures of length, it was so small as fittingly to typify a short period of time.††

## § 52. OF JUDGING OTHERS.

*Matt. vii., 1-5 ; Luke vi., 37-42.*

With the condemnation of censoriousness, which is the leading topic of this section, Luke blends other ideas suggested by the form quite as much as by the thought of the leading injunction. To the simple antithesis of judging and being judged, condemning and being condemned, he adds releas-

\* ἡλικία.

† Luke ii., 52.

‡ John ix., 21, 23 ; Heb. xi., 11.

§ For a classical instance of its use in the sense of “age,” see Xen., *Anab.*, i., 9, 6.

|| The Psalmist says (xxxix., 5), “Behold thou hast made my days as handbreadths, and my age is as nothing before thee.”

¶ τοῖς ἡμέλοι πῆχυιον ἐπὶ χρόνον ἀνθεῖν ἥβης τερόμεθα.—ii., 3, 4.

\*\* The cubit = about eighteen inches.

†† But see Potwin’s *Here and There in the Greek N. T.*, 104-110.

ing and being released, giving and receiving. The idea of compensation in kind is the single thread upon which all these thoughts are strung.<sup>1</sup> In the injunction to generosity (verse 38) the language used has reference to the measuring of grain and the use of the fold of the loose outer garment above the girdle as a pocket. If we had only the text of Matthew it might seem that Jesus meant to give a higher meaning to the worldly Jewish maxim which he cites, and to teach that as we judge our fellow-men so God will judge us, and that we ourselves are bound to conform to the standard by which we judge others; but according to Luke he appears rather to affirm simply that generosity will be likely to be met with generosity. In the concluding portion of the section, *mote* and *beam* are the best words that can be used, notwithstanding the difficulty which the imagination finds in realising the picture of the latter.<sup>2</sup>

### § 53. OF EXPOSING THE TRUTH TO CONTEMPT

*Matt. vii., 6.*

It is useless to try to trace any connection of thought between this verse and what has immediately preceded. This want of connection deprives us of one of the most important helps toward determining the meaning of any passage—a perception of its logical relation to what has gone before and what comes after. Under these circumstances the right understanding of this injunction depends largely upon assigning to certain figurative terms their true meanings. The passage has the appearance of belonging to the instruction

<sup>1</sup> The so-called parable of verse 39 seems here quite out of place (cp. Matt. xv., 14, which has a better connection), as does also the following verse.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. this saying from the Talmud: “If one says to anybody, ‘Take out the mote which is in your eye,’ he receives for a response, ‘Take out the beam which is in your own.’”

of Jesus to his immediate disciples with regard to their missionary work. *That which is holy* will then be the truth which they have to offer to the world, symbolised in the parallel member of the sentence as *pearls*. *Dogs* and *swine* do not represent unlike conceptions, being only different figurative embodiments of one and the same notion. However it may be elsewhere,<sup>1</sup> there is nothing here to indicate that these epithets were intended to apply specially to the Gentiles, as some have supposed. The reference is rather to men of depraved and brutish minds, wherever found, who, having no appreciation of the worth of truth, not only reject it, but even despise and abuse its messengers.

#### § 54. THE PARABLE OF THE MIDNIGHT CALL.

*Luke xi., 5-8.*

Other titles which have been given to this parable are "A selfish neighbour," "The friend at midnight," "The importunate friend." The parable is peculiar in not being in the usual narrative form, neither is its structure harmonious throughout. A case is supposed of one of two neighbours needing the friendly offices of the other, who grants the desired favour, but grudgingly, since it puts him to inconvenience. The application is made courteously, *Friend, lend me three loaves*, but the response is blunt and uncivil, almost a command to be gone. Nevertheless, as the quickest way of getting rid of the unwelcome intruder, his request is complied with. Although there is no formal application of the parable, yet the following context makes it evident that its purpose is to give assurance of the divine answer to earnest prayer. There is involved an argument of this sort : if a selfish man even against his will can be induced by persistent appeal to do what is asked of him, how much more

<sup>1</sup> For instance, in Matt. xv., 26.

ready will the Heavenly Father be to grant the requests of his children. The parable does not represent the Deity as yielding to the importunities of men : there is simply an effort to make the hearer comprehend the reasonableness of prayer by a pictorial argument from the less to the greater.

#### § 55. ENCOURAGEMENT TO ASKING IN PRAYER.

*Matt. vii., 7-11 ; Luke xi., 9-13.*

In Matthew no connection of any sort can be traced between this passage and what has preceded ; but in Luke these five verses constitute a natural supplement to the foregoing parable. The statement *And I<sup>1</sup> say unto you* distinguishes the direct and plain words of Jesus from the masked teaching of the parable, which is in form only a picture from life. The new phases under which prayer is here presented, namely, as asking, seeking, and knocking, if not a direct reflection from the parable, yet harmonise excellently with it. Although the reasons which support the injunctions of the opening verse have a certain gnomic character, as though simply stating a common fact of life, they do not rest in this, but suggest the spiritual law that asking is the condition of receiving divine gifts and that to ask of God is to put one's self in the way of receiving that which one asks. This broad principle is sadly perverted when attempted to be brought into support of an expectation that whatever a man may choose to ask for he certainly will receive. It is simply an expression, as the following verses show, of the overflowing bountifulness and generosity of Divine Providence. If, in human relations, parental love can be trusted to help and not to harm its objects, much more, says Jesus, should we have confidence in the good-will of the Divine Giver. So far from the first words of the last verse teaching, as is sometimes claimed, the doctrine of the innate depravity of man,

<sup>1</sup> The " I " is emphatic.

they simply contrast the imperfection of human nature with the perfection of the divine attributes.

### § 56. THE "GOLDEN RULE" OF DUTY.

*Matt. vii., 12; Luke vi., 31.*

Matthew's *therefore* indicates a logical connection with what has gone before; but it is far from evident what is the real ground of inference. The position of the passage in Luke in the midst of what is said of loving one's enemies (§ 42) seems more natural. When it is said that *this is the law and the prophets*, the most that can be meant is that this comprises the substance of the Old Testament teaching,—for no such language is there to be found. Hillel<sup>1</sup> meant the same thing when he said of the Golden Rule, "This is the principal commandment of the law; all the rest is only commentary" (*a*).

#### NOTE.

(*a*, p. 131) The remark is often met with in books and repeated in sermons, that only Jesus gives the Golden Rule in a positive form, all others simply teaching that one should not do to another what he would not wish to have done to himself. This statement is not in accordance with facts. Neither can the Golden Rule have originated either with Jesus or with Hillel, since it is found in literature of a much earlier date than the time of their birth.\* Evidently the

<sup>1</sup> In the opinion of Delitzsch, Hillel was born in almost the same year as Jesus, but Stapfer places him thirty and Renan fifty years earlier. One of the two latter suppositions is necessary to the support of Renan's statement that "by his poverty so meekly borne, by the gentleness of his character, by his antagonism to priests and hypocrites, Hillel was the true master of Jesus, if one may speak of a master in connection with so lofty an originality."—*Life of Jesus*, ch. iii.

\* Diogenes Laërtius says of Aristotle, who flourished about the middle of the fourth century B.C., that "the question was once put to him, how we ought to behave to our friends, and the answer he gave was, 'As we should wish our friends to behave to us'"; and of



early Christians did not recognise the superiority of the affirmative form, since in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (ch. i.) we find, "All things whatsoever thou wouldst should not happen to thee do not thou to another"; and a document of the third century ascribed, though without sufficient authority, to Pope Fabian, declares that "the Master says, 'Do not to another that which thou wouldst not have done to thyself.'"

### § 57. THE NARROW GATE.

*Matt. vii., 13, 14, Luke xiii., 23, 24.*

Notwithstanding the substantial parallelism of Matthew and Luke in this section, the latter is reporting something which took place during the last journey of Jesus to Jerusalem and not at the time of the Sermon on the Mount. The difficulty of attaining to the Messianic salvation constitutes the essence of the teaching of both passages. Luke makes someone to have inquired of Jesus whether the number of those who would secure this salvation would be few or many<sup>1</sup>: Matthew does not tell us how Jesus came to speak upon this subject. No direct answer is given to the inquirer, but only the intimation that he would do better to be looking out for his own salvation than speculating upon such a fruitless problem. Nevertheless there is something like an incidental answer to the question later in Luke xiii., 29, more nearly negative than affirmative.<sup>2</sup> *Strive* is hardly a strong

Thales, who belongs to the seventh century B.C., that he replied to the inquiry how men might live most virtuously and most justly, "If we never do ourselves what we blame in others." In the latter part of the fourth century B.C., Isocrates wrote: "What it would make you angry to suffer from anybody else, that do not to others." In the Jewish apocryphal book of Tobit (iv., 15) is the injunction, "Do to no man that which thou hatest."

<sup>1</sup> The question is answered in 2 Esd. viii., 3: "There be many created, but few shall be saved."

<sup>2</sup> "And they shall come from the east and west, and from the north and south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God."

enough word to represent the original, which implies the persistent putting forth of the greatest possible effort. The time when many will *seek to enter in* and not be able is the time of the Messianic judgment, their inability then being the inevitable result of their present neglect of opportunity. The *destruction*<sup>1</sup> spoken of in Matthew is neither annihilation nor unending torment. There is no better English word by which to represent the Greek in this passage than "ruin." The fundamental idea is that of "loss"—loss of the offered salvation. It is the opposite of *life*<sup>2</sup> (verse 14), and its precise significance must be determined with reference to the force of that word in its present connection. Now the life spoken of is not mere sensuous existence, but a nobler life under conditions more desirable than the present—life in "the kingdom of God" (verse 29). The "ruin" of which Jesus speaks must then be all that which this "life" is not, that is, failure to be what one might have been—a conscious son of God. "Life," in the New Testament,<sup>3</sup> is holiness; sin is that spiritual torpor which is symbolised by "death."<sup>4</sup>

## § 58. THE TEST OF GOODNESS.

*Matt. vii., 15-20, xii., 33-35; Luke vi., 43-45.*

The *false prophets* against whom the disciples are warned are false Christian teachers. A "prophet" under the New Testament dispensation is not primarily a foreteller of future

<sup>1</sup> ἀπώλεια, *apōlēia*.

<sup>2</sup> ζωή, *zōē*.

<sup>3</sup> When ζωή and not βίος (*biōs*) is the Greek word. For the distinction between the two see Trench's *Synonyms of the N. T.*, § xxvii.

<sup>4</sup> The opening sentences of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* are a good commentary upon this passage: "There are two ways, one of life and one of death; and a great difference between the two ways"; and as characteristics of the way of life are given the two great principles of Christian living—love to God and love to man.

events, but one speaking by divine inspiration.<sup>1</sup> A "false prophet" is therefore one whose inspiration is pretended and not genuine.<sup>2</sup> The teaching of the following verses in Matthew has often been perverted by Protestant exegetes in their controversies with the Roman Catholic Church. The latter rightly claims that the conduct of the false teachers is spoken of as furnishing a test of their true character. Not only does the opening statement, "by their fruits ye will recognise them," plainly indicate this, but the repetition of the remark at the close of the illustration, something like the *q. e. d.* of a geometrical proof,<sup>3</sup> precludes the drawing of any other inference. To make the passage teach that only the good tree of faith in Christ (that is, in his sacrificial atonement) can produce works acceptable to God is to introduce what the language does not suggest and what is altogether foreign to the connection of thought. Matthew's question, "Do they gather from thorn-bushes bunches of grapes, or from thistles figs?" takes on in Luke a declarative form corresponding to its intended meaning. The second passage from Matthew belongs to the reply of Jesus to the calumnies of the Pharisees, and is not a part of the Sermon on the Mount; but, being a practical application of the "test of goodness" established in that discourse, besides being partly

<sup>1</sup> The Hebrew *nābhî*, or "prophet," says Gesenius, is "one who, impelled by a divine impulse, or by the Divine Spirit, rebukes kings and nations and predicts future events."—*Heb. and Eng. Lex.*, Robinson's 14th ed., 641.

<sup>2</sup> It is unlikely that Jesus thus early in his career should have anticipated the faithlessness of some of his pretended followers. This detached passage is therefore to be looked upon as probably derived from the striking predictions uttered on the Mount of Olives shortly before his death. See Matt. xxiv., 11, 24; Mark xiii., 22.

<sup>3</sup> The neatness of the argument is somewhat obscured by the unsuitable introduction of verse 19, apparently borrowed from iii., 10, on account of the similarity of its phraseology to that of the present passage.

found in Luke in connection with what is there said of the sound and the rotten tree and their fruits, it has a fitting place in this section. Jesus had been charged with doing a good deed—the casting out of demons—by power derived from the prince of the demons. He demands of his calumniators that they shall be consistent and call his deeds evil if they really believe that they come from an evil source, or, if they recognise them as good, shall acknowledge his power to be derived from God; for the fruit of good works does not grow upon the decayed tree of evil thoughts and desires but upon the tree of life. At the end of the section the figure of the tree and its fruits is exchanged for that of the treasure-house and its contents; and last of all, in Luke's order, the words of the mouth are made the criterion of the purity or the depravity of the heart.

#### § 59. EMPTY PROFESSIONS OF DISCIPLESHIP

*Matt. vii., 21-23; Luke vi., 46, xiii., 26, 27.*

The test of the true prophet is now made the test of the true disciple. Jesus declares that acknowledging him as Master<sup>1</sup> counts for nothing unless one lives in accordance with the divine precepts announced by him. By the repetition of the title of address added emphasis is given to the claim of discipleship, as though Jesus had said, "Not everyone who makes a loud profession of being my follower." Both the expressions of time here used, *in that day* and *then*, refer to the "judgment" which is to precede the coming of the king-

<sup>1</sup> Since there can be no reasonable doubt that the language used by Jesus was Aramaic, *κύριε* (*kuriē*, E. V. "Lord") is probably representative of *rabbi*, and should be translated either "rabbi" or "master" rather than "Lord." In support of the position that *κύριος* "came to be used as a title in addressing the Messiah," and that Jesus here applies to himself this phrase as a Messianic title, Meyer has but the one altogether inconclusive passage, John xiii., 13, 14, to cite.

dom of heaven.<sup>1</sup> What Luke has in common with Matthew's last two verses belongs to his fuller and more scenic representation of the event, portions of which are assigned to other sections.<sup>2</sup> The concluding phraseology of the section is borrowed from the Old Testament<sup>3</sup> (*a*).

NOTE.

(*a*, p. 136) Jesus here appears as the Messianic judge ; but since there is no other indication in the Gospels that he thus early acknowledged his Messiahship in any sense of the term, it is likely that Matthew has erred in making this passage a part of the Sermon on the Mount. There is a certain subtle connection of thought between this section and the preceding, which accounts for the bringing together of the two passages. The "false prophets" and the "workers of iniquity" belong to one and the same class. The false prophets are among the false disciples.

§ 60. BUILDING ON THE ROCK AND ON THE SAND.

*Matt. vii., 24-27 ; Luke vi., 47-49.*

The mountain discourse of Jesus, in both Matthew and Luke, ends with a double simile. Two men are represented as building each a house near or upon the bed of a dry water-course. According to Matthew, one selects a site where an already bare ledge affords a firm foundation ; according to Luke, he digs and goes down deep into the earth until he comes to the underlying rock. This man typifies one who not only hears the teaching of Jesus, but takes it to heart and acts upon it—one who is *wise* or "prudent,"<sup>4</sup> that is, mindful of what is safest and best. The other man, who in

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Matt. x., 15 ; Luke x., 12.

<sup>2</sup> See the whole paragraph, Luke xiii., 22-30, and its distribution as indicated in the "Text-Index."

<sup>3</sup> Ps. vi., 8.

<sup>4</sup> *φρόνιμος*, *phrōnimōs*.

Matthew is called *foolish*<sup>1</sup> (Luke applies no epithet to either one), builds upon the sandy wash of the river-bed (Luke says simply upon the *ground*) without laying any foundation. In the rainy season a raging torrent suddenly fills to overflowing the empty channel, and the walls of the foolish man's house fall in, a heap of ruins. The picture is true to the conditions of life in Palestine at the present day. In Matthew this section is closely related to what precedes, as is indicated by the connecting *therefore*. That there is no reference in the first part of the simile to Jesus as the rock on which alone an enduring moral and religious character can be built, as is claimed by some exegetes, becomes evident in the light of this connection. Jesus simply seeks, by these two similitudes, to deepen the impression of his words concerning *hearing* and *doing*.

#### § 61. EPILOGUE TO THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

*Matt. vii., 28, 29.*

This is the evangelist's testimony to the effect of the teaching of Jesus upon those who heard it. They were struck with its individuality and freshness. The scribes were simply expounders of the law ; he claimed the right to revise the law itself. This boldness excited their astonishment. To what extent he secured their sympathy is not stated (*a*).

#### NOTE.

(*a*, p. 137) Notwithstanding the general unity which characterises the Sermon on the Mount, the lack of close connection between its parts, as well as the fact that in Luke's Gospel many passages have a more suitable connection, suggests the query whether we have not in the First Gospel a

<sup>1</sup> μωρός, mōrōs,

composite discourse made up of elements belonging to different periods of the teaching of Jesus. That there is confusion in Matthew's record appears from the fact that some things found in the Sermon on the Mount are repeated by him in other connections. There is, however, always the possibility of the same sayings having been uttered more than once. Although Matthew was one of the twelve and Luke was not, this gives the former little advantage as a reporter of this discourse, since, according to his own account,\* he did not become a disciple of Jesus until after its delivery. It is true that he *may* have heard the discourse, but of this there is no evidence. In any case so extended an address could not be expected to be completely retained in the memory and accurately reported by anyone; so that neither Matthew nor Luke may have preserved more than an imperfect outline of what was said.

## § 62. THE CENTURION'S SERVANT.

*Matt. viii., 5-13; Luke vii., 1-10, xiii., 28-30.*

The differences between the accounts of Matthew and Luke are not such as to warrant the inference that two distinct events are described; but the somewhat similar story in the Fourth Gospel<sup>1</sup> apparently refers to another occasion. This centurion,<sup>2</sup> or captain, may have been in the service either of the Roman Government or of Herod Antipas—more likely of the latter. He appears to have been merely friendly to the Jews and not an avowed proselyte to their faith, judging not only from the language of the *elders*<sup>3</sup> but also from

\* See Matt. ix., 9.

<sup>1</sup> iv., 46-53.

<sup>2</sup> The Roman centurion was originally, as his name suggests, the captain of an hundred men.

<sup>3</sup> These are not the official elders, members of the sanhedrin, but, so far as we can see, simply some of the older influential men of the city. Thayer makes them represent "those who in the separate states managed public affairs and administered justice."

the way in which Jesus speaks of him. This evidence, however, is partly lacking in Matthew, who represents him as appealing to Jesus in person.<sup>1</sup> The two accounts differ in the way in which they speak of the disease of the centurion's servant.<sup>2</sup> Matthew represents him as prostrated by some nervous affection which he calls *palsy*; but, beyond saying that he was "suffering terribly," he is silent as to the symptoms of the case. Luke only says, in general terms, that he was sick and at death's door.<sup>3</sup> Three circumstances are especially to be noted, that the hesitation of the centurion about asking Jesus to his house indicates a knowledge of and consideration for the usual Jewish unwillingness to run the risk of ceremonial defilement by closely associating with heathen, that he believed Jesus to be able to cure at a distance, and that the evangelist supposed that the sick one was thus cured. The centurion urges upon Jesus this consideration in support of the form of his request, that if he, a mere soldier acting under the direction of a higher authority, can send subordinates to execute his commands, certainly one who has power over the demons of disease can compel them to depart from their victims without himself going into the presence of the sufferer.

In the figurative language toward the end of the section the kingdom of heaven is likened, as often by the Jews, to a great feast, where, according to the popular conception, the

<sup>1</sup> His salutation is the one considered in connection with § 59, p. 135, where see Note <sup>1</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Matthew has the ambiguous word *παῖς* (*pais*), meaning either "boy" or "servant"; but Luke, by using both *παῖς* and *δοῦλος* (*dōulōs*, "servant" or "slave"), shows that he does not understand the sufferer to have been the centurion's son. Holtzmann offers unsatisfactory reasons for thinking that Luke has perverted the meaning of his source.

<sup>3</sup> This is not in harmony with the assertion often made, that Luke's constant use of technical medical language shows him to have been a physician.



*sons of the kingdom*—that is, all faithful Israelites—would share the company of the patriarchs and prophets, reclining with them upon the festal couches.<sup>1</sup> Here we have the reverse of the picture, many of the Gentiles being admitted to the brilliantly lighted banqueting-hall, while the sons of the kingdom are forced to remain in the darkness without, where they give violent expression to their disappointment and rage. Luke's 30th verse repeats the thought in a less realistic form.<sup>2</sup>

### § 63. THE BAPTIST'S INQUIRY

*Matt. xi., 2-6; Luke vii., 18-23.*

Josephus tells us that it was in the fortress of Machærus, east of the Dead Sea, that John was imprisoned. Luke makes no mention here of the fact that the Baptist was at this time in prison—perhaps because he had previously spoken of his arrest.<sup>3</sup> The *works* of Jesus which led John to send messengers to him to ask if he was “the coming one” need not be limited to the wonderful cures which he had been performing, but may include his teaching as well. “When John heard what Jesus was doing” would express the idea. In Luke, however, the reference appears to be primarily to the healing of the centurion's servant and the restoration to life of the young man of Nain, described in the immediately preceding paragraphs. The expression *all these things* really seems, however, too comprehensive to be limited to these two occurrences, and may include both the discourse on the mount and the cure performed in the synagogue on

<sup>1</sup> The Jews, like the Greeks and Romans, reclined at table.

<sup>2</sup> The attachment to this narrative, in Matthew, of verses 11 and 12, to which Luke gives a very different setting, points to a late redaction under the influence of a universalism which was not so early developed in the mind of Jesus as this arrangement indicates.

<sup>3</sup> Luke iii., 20.

the sabbath. The question "Art thou the coming one?" is to be understood, in the light of iii., 16, as equivalent to "Art thou the expected Messiah?"<sup>1</sup> (a). Luke's 21st verse, the need of which is not felt by Matthew, elucidates and prepares the way for the instructions given in verse 22. The reply given to John's messengers remands to their master, without direct answer, the question which they had brought, and which could not be answered by a simple "yes" or "no," since Jesus both was and was not "the coming one." The Messianic ideas of Jesus were far from being like those of John, and he chose to leave it to the Baptist to frame his own opinion from the nature of the work in which he found him to be engaged. This work, as John's two disciples beheld it, and as Jesus directed them to report it, was one of human helpfulness in deed and speech (b).

## NOTES.

(a, p. 141) The thought and purpose of John in asking this question has been variously interpreted, according as this paragraph is allowed to speak for itself, or is brought into relation to other passages and made to harmonise with their supposed teaching. Questioning, under such circumstances, naturally implies doubt on the part of the questioner; but many critics, perhaps most, have maintained that John could not have been in doubt, since the Messiahship of Jesus had been attested to him by a voice from heaven at the time of the baptism.\* Some, however, who believe in this attestation think that John was beginning to have doubts: the last words of Jesus to the messengers† are thought to indicate this. The various opinions which have prevailed may be tabulated thus:

1. *John was in doubt*: (1) having once believed in the Messianic mission of Jesus, but now finding his faith beginning to waver because the supposed Messiah did not make greater

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Luke xiii., 35, xix., 38; and especially Heb. x., 37. See Winer's *Gram. N. T.*, § 45, 1, d.

\* See § 15, p. 57.

† Matt., verse 6; Luke, verse 23.

haste in his work, and because of his not living up to the strict requirements of the ceremonial law ; (2) but now beginning, in view of the wonderful works of Jesus, to think that he might possibly be the Messiah.

2. *John was not in doubt* (1) yet was at a loss how to account for the apparent slowness of Jesus, and was impatient because of it ; (2) but could not understand why the Messiah should be so regardless of the requirements of the law ; (3) but uncertain as to whether the one whose fame was abroad in the land was Jesus or not ; (4) but wished to draw out from Jesus a distinct declaration which might make an impression upon the people ; (5) but desirous of convincing his disciples who were doubtful ; (6) but impatient (a) because Jesus did not release him from prison and (b) “ ‘ cleanse his threshing-floor ’ of such refuse as Antipas and Herodias.”

(b, p. 141) The language in which it is described is to be taken literally ; yet, with regard to the statement that *the dead are raised*, it is necessary to choose between the supposition that historically these words are not to be ascribed to Jesus himself but to the chronicler, and the assumption that the word “ dead ” is here as not infrequently elsewhere in the New Testament to be understood tropically\* ; for the two recorded instances of the resurrection of Jairus’s daughter and of the young man of Nain (the only cases mentioned by the Synoptics) furnish a too slender basis for a statement which places occurrences of this kind on a substantial level, as to frequency, with ordinary cures of diseases.

#### § 64. TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE BAPTIST.

*Matt. xi., 7-19 ; Luke vii., 24-28, xvi., 16, vii., 31-35.*

The three interrogatories concerning John which Jesus addresses to the multitudes are well calculated to fix their attention and prepare their minds for the direct affirmations which are to follow. “ When, attracted by the reputation of John, you went out into the wilderness where he was preaching, what did you see—a reed shaken by the wind ? ”

\* See, in the Synoptics, Matt. viii., 22 ; Luke xv., 24, 32.

he asks. Although several critics of good repute have taken the word *reed* literally and made the question to signify "Did you go out into the wilderness merely to see the reeds growing along the river-bank?"<sup>1</sup> the harmony of the passage is better preserved by supposing a reference to the character of John, which, it is implied, he would very much mistake who should think of it as unstable and fickle.<sup>2</sup> As the disciples of Jesus himself did not yet look upon their master as the Messiah, it cannot have been John's uncertainty upon this point which gave form to the question. It would seem to have been the purpose of Jesus simply to call attention to the sturdiness of John's character. The second question, with its supporting affirmation, calls attention to the simple and frugal life of John: "Did you go out into the wilderness to see a man gorgeously attired? That cannot be, for you certainly must have known that John was not a man living in royal luxury, whose splendid appearance it was worth going many miles to see." "If then you found John to be neither weak nor self-indulgent, perhaps you recognised in him a man of a very different stamp, even a prophet," is the next suggestion of Jesus, through which he reaches that which from the start it was his purpose to say. The Baptist is first included by him among the prophets, then immediately advanced to a position of honour far above theirs, but only to be ranked at last beneath the humblest citizens of the new kingdom of whose coming he is only the herald (*a*). The greater glory of the new dispensation of the spirit here inspires the thought of Jesus, as afterwards that of Paul.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This gives to the question a telic force corresponding to its form, instead of making it ecclastic.

<sup>2</sup> "Shaken by the wind" is a weak and superfluous addition, if the word "reed" is to be taken literally. The plural "reeds" would also be demanded.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. 2 Cor. iii., 7-II. Verses 29 and 30 in Luke (which see) have been remanded to another section, since they sound more like an

The eagerness with which the multitude listened to the preaching of John and the general Messianic excitement of the times are spoken of by Jesus as a taking of the kingdom of heaven by storm. Referring to the prophetic character of the Old Testament Scriptures, according to which Elijah was to reappear upon earth before the ushering in of the good time coming, he declares that John has come "in the spirit and power of Elijah,"<sup>1</sup> the clause *if ye are willing to receive it* [or *him*] suggesting that they were to look for no other Elijah. *He that hath ears to hear let him hear* invites their serious attention to the purport of this declaration concerning John. If the message of the Baptist was a true one (and the readiness with which great numbers accepted it indicated a widespread belief that it was so), then the kingdom of heaven was near at hand and it became them to be prepared for its advent.

Seeing at the same time a likeness and a difference in the way in which he and his predecessor had been received by their countrymen, Jesus likens the Jews of that generation to wayward children, who, in their sports, cannot be satisfied with anything which their comrades do, but always want something different. When one wants to play funeral, another wants to play wedding. At weddings and other joyous festivals among the Jews there was generally dancing to the music of the pipe; at funerals a mournful dirge was sung, while the weeping friends of the deceased beat their breasts as a sign of sorrow. The austerity of the life of John and his stern call to repentance were like a solemn dirge, while

editor's comment than like words of Jesus. However, whether intended to be ascribed to Jesus or parenthetically introduced by the evangelist as an incidental remark of his own, they furnish a not unsuitable connecting link with what follows, calling attention, as they do, to the coldness with which John was treated by the leaders of the Pharisaic party.

<sup>1</sup> Luke i., 17.

the freer life of Jesus was, by contrast, rather suggestive of the gladness of the wedding-feast.

When Jesus, in Matthew's account, speaks of himself as *eating and drinking* and of John as *neither eating nor drinking*, the sense is to be completed from the 33d verse of Luke, where it is said that "John the Baptist has come neither eating bread nor drinking wine." Nothing more is meant than that, while John lived an ascetic life, subsisting upon such fruits of nature as the wilderness afforded, Jesus dwelt among men, eating and drinking as they did, and not attracting attention to himself by any peculiarities of life or demeanour. The concluding words of the section are not only obscure in their application, but they are somewhat differently reported by Matthew and Luke. The former has *Wisdom is [or was] justified by her works*, while the latter reads, *Wisdom is [or was] justified of all her children*. In Matthew's form the thought is that the results, in the case both of John and Jesus, were such as to make evident the wisdom of that Divine Providence which sent them into the world as heralds of truth. In Luke the only difference is that the *disciples* of John and of Jesus are said to furnish this justification, which they did, in part at least, by their *works*. The thought in Luke seems to be somewhat more inclusive than in Matthew, taking cognisance of the indirect as well as the direct results of the missions of the two prophets.<sup>1</sup>

#### NOTE.

(a, p. 143) The quotation in the 10th verse of Matthew and the 27th of Luke is from the beginning of Mal. iii., where, in the Revised Version, it reads, "Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me." \* As

<sup>1</sup> If the aorist verb *ἐδικαιώθη* (*ēdikaiōthē*) is used in a present or indefinite sense = "is justified," then the statement is simply an utterance of proverbial wisdom having universal application.

\* Cp. Mark i., 2; Luke i., 76, and see Norton's note on Matt. xi., 10, and Toy, 31-33.

the following context makes clear, Malachi announces the advent of some vigorous reformer, such as John the Baptist really was,—although there is no reason to suppose that the prophet had any particular individual in his mind.

### § 65. CHARGE OF BEING IN LEAGUE WITH BEELZEBUB.

*Matt. ix., 32-34, xii., 22-24; Mark iii., 20-22; Luke xi., 14-16.*

Only Mark's very concise account presents Jesus in the midst of a dense crowd from which his friends seek to withdraw him, thinking that he is acting strangely. To the casting out of demons Mark simply refers, without mentioning the particular cases described by Matthew and Luke. Of the two narratives from the Matthew-Gospel the first agrees with Luke in describing the cure of one who was dumb and perhaps deaf<sup>1</sup> also, while in the second case (*a*) to dumbness was added blindness.<sup>2</sup> When the scribes, in

<sup>1</sup> Since total deafness is usually accompanied by dumbness, it is not strange that *κωφός* (*kōphōs*), which primarily means only "blunted" or "dull," should sometimes be used, as in *Matt. xi., 5; Mark vii., 32, 37, xi., 25; Luke vii., 22; and in the LXX. of Ex. iv., 11; Is. xliii., 8; Ps. xxxvii., 14, and elsewhere, as well as in several of the classics, in the sense of "deaf."*

<sup>2</sup> The word used is *τυφλός* (*tuphlōs*), which comes from a root signifying to darken or obscure, as by smoke. It can neither be affirmed nor denied that the evangelists here thought of total deafness and total blindness. On blindness among the Orientals, see McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopædia*, i., 833. What Prof. George B. Fisher, of Yale University, says, in speaking of ecclesiastical miracles, is worth considering here: "Oculists know well that cases of total or partial blindness are sometimes instantly relieved. What was the special cause of the disorder in this instance? Had there been symptoms of amendment before? Was the cure complete at the moment? As long as we are unable to answer these and like questions, it is unwise to assume that there was a miracle."—*Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, 297.

Mark's account, declare that Jesus "has Beelzebub," they imply that he is possessed by no common demon but by the most powerful of them all. In verse 30 he is referred to simply as an "unclean spirit."

## NOTE.

(a, p. 146) It is quite possible that the First Gospel contains two versions of one and the same story. The repetition of the strange charge against Jesus lends colour to this supposition. Much less likely is it that, as some suppose, Matt. xx., 29-34, again repeats the story with other variations; for, besides that there are there two blind men and that nothing is said about dumbness, the occasion is very different and there is no intimation that Jesus is an agent of Beelzebub\*—the central point in the narratives of this section.

## § 66. REPLY OF JESUS.

*Matt. xii., 25-32, 36, 37; Mark iii., 23-30; Luke xi., 17-23, xii., 10.*

To the charge of being in league with the powers of evil Jesus replies with a *reductio ad absurdum*, but using language

\* If we were to follow the Greek MSS. we should adopt the spelling "Beelzebul," or "Beezebul" (found in two of the oldest uncials), in place of the common form which occurs only in the Latin Vulgate and a few other versions. (See Tisch., *N. T. Gr.*, ed. 8va crit. major, on Matt. x., 25, and xii., 24; Plummer's *Luke*, 301). The meaning of the name will vary according to the form chosen. "Beelzebub," "the lord (*i. e.* destroyer) of flies," was a Philistine deity: to "Beelzebul" have been assigned various significations, chiefly "lord of dung" and "lord of the dwelling." It is not certain, as sometimes said, that the Jews identified Beelzebub with Satan. What Jesus says in the next section indicates only that in his mind there was a close relation existing between the two. Milton probably had rabbinical authority for writing:

"Which when Beelzebub perceived, than whom,  
Satan excepted, none higher sat."

*Paradise Lost*, ii., 299.

The word does not occur in the N. T. outside of the Synoptics.



so largely figurative that Mark speaks of it as parabolic. The absurdity consists in supposing that Satan would destroy his own work. Only in union is there strength ; and that kingdom, or city, or household in which dissension exists among those who rule it is destined to sure destruction. This is not a mere group of rhetorical illustrations, but a serious argument from analogy. By Satan's coming to an end, in Mark's 26th verse, is meant his ceasing to have power over men. The variety of the phrases used in the conditional sentence which is common to the three Gospels, in which Satan is spoken of as rising up against himself, as casting himself out, as divided against himself, indicates a free use of figurative language which strives in various ways to give expression to a thought not capable of clear definition. The *argumentum ad hominem* which follows rests upon the acknowledged fact that the sons, *i. e.*, disciples,<sup>1</sup> of the Pharisees sometimes relieved demoniacs.<sup>2</sup> In refuting the charge that he casts out demons by diabolic agency Jesus has virtually established the counter position that he does it by power derived from God—for Satan is the only rival of Jehovah. An important inference is drawn from this fact : the despoiling of Satan of his power over men shows that the establishment of the kingdom of God upon earth has already begun. In the parabolic language concerning *the strong man* and *a stronger than he*, the former represents Satan and the latter the divine power manifested in the healing acts of Jesus. The overthrow of the emissaries of Satan implied the presence of a stronger power than that of Satan himself. The sententious and perhaps proverbial saying of Jesus, "The one who is not with me is against me, and the one who gathers not with me scatters," may be understood either as a declaration of the impossibility of anyone's remaining

<sup>1</sup> Pupils were often called the sons of their teachers. See 1 Kings xx., 35 ; 2 Kings ii.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. 1 Sam. xvi., 14, 23 ; Tob. viii., 1-3.

neutral in the world-contest between good and evil, or as a virtual declaration that those who had been slandering him, when they might reasonably have been expected to be his allies, were, so far as in them lay, undoing God's work. The latter interpretation furnishes the better connection with what follows,—a connection which Matthew's *therefore*<sup>1</sup> makes necessary. Although this formal connection is lacking in Mark, and in Luke the saying concerning blasphemy<sup>2</sup> against the Holy Spirit comes somewhat later, there can be no doubt that, in the first two Gospels, by this blasphemy is not meant, as so often taught, that there is some one particular sin which God will never under any circumstances forgive, either in this life or in the life to come (*a*), but simply that those who had maliciously charged Jesus with being in collusion with the prince of the demons, thus deliberately calling good evil and evil good, showed a hardness of heart not likely to yield to any softening influences (*b*). In order to make still more clear the nature of their guilt, as well as to render it impossible for them to charge his severe language to personal animosity, he declares that it is not evil-speaking against him as a man, *the Son of Man*, which constitutes their offence,—for that this might easily be forgiven,—but their insult to the divine Spirit of Truth. When it is said that “all manner of sins will be forgiven,” nothing more is meant than that they are *forgivable* or *pardonable*.<sup>3</sup> The last utterance of Jesus, as Matthew gives it (verses 36, 37), contains a thought partly new, but a natural development of what has gone before,—that men are responsible for their words as well as for their deeds. *The day of judgment* is the time of the coming of the Messiah. Mark's concluding

<sup>1</sup> διὰ τοῦτο.

<sup>2</sup> βλασφημία (*blasphēmia*) = “evil-speaking.”

<sup>3</sup> It is in accordance with Hebrew usage that the one exception is introduced not by a mere limiting clause but in the form of a distinct counter proposition.

words (verse 30) are the evangelist's own account of what led Jesus to speak as he did of "the sin against the Holy Spirit," referring back to verse 22.

#### NOTES.

(a, p. 149) Luke has no expression denoting time, and the phraseology of Matthew and Mark has not the kind of temporal meaning which the Authorised Version assigns to it, and which the Revised Version retains, although giving in the margin of Matthew an alternative rendering. Mark has two words—the noun *aion* and the adjective *aionios*\*—the former of which only has hitherto been met with † in certain idiomatic phrases. The noun occurs more than one hundred and the adjective about seventy times in the New Testament. The derivation of the words being uncertain, ‡ their signification can be determined only by induction from instances of classical and Biblical usage. In early classical literature *aion* signifies "a period of time," not current time,—time considered as divisible into an indefinite number of parts,—which is *chrōnōs*, § but time in mass, so to speak. Its special use is to describe the natural period of human life. Closely connected with this idea of wholeness is the conception of time as a unit, to which there are no conceivable limits either before or after. Thus, so far as extant literature enables us to trace the growth of the meaning of the word, the development appears to have been from the limited to the unlimited, from finite wholes to an infinite whole. Four hundred years before the time of Christ Plato used *aion*, as Mark does here, to describe that to which the imagination fixes no limits. As the noun so the adjective varies in meaning according to the nature of that to which it is applied. This is amply illustrated in the LXX., where *aionios* is used to translate Hebrew words very variously rendered in our common English Version. || When *aion* is used, as here in Matt. xii., 32, in the

\* *αἰών*, *αἰώνιος*.

† Luke i., 33, 55, 70; the interpolated doxology of the Lord's Prayer, Matt. vi., 13.

‡ See a concise summary of opinions in Thayer, 18.

§ *χρόνος*.

|| In the following passages the words in *italics* are the equivalents

contrasted phrases "this age" and "the coming age," the Messianic and pre-Messianic periods are distinguished, and not the present and the future life of man; consequently the common translation, "this world" and "the world to come," is now (although it was not in King James's time) altogether misleading, and "age" should be substituted for "world." As the Messianic kingdom is to be an everlasting kingdom, Matthew's statement is substantially equivalent to that of Mark.

(b, p. 149) Comparing the Authorised and the Revised Versions we notice that the latter has substituted for "is in danger of eternal damnation" *is guilty of an eternal sin*. The soundest textual criticism required the substitution of "sin" for "damnation," but no other change was needed.\* In the previous clause the translation should be not *hath never forgiveness* but "hath no remission," *i. e.*, no release from

of *aionios* in the LXX. In Gen. xxi., 33, Jehovah is "the *everlasting* God" because eternity of being is one of the essential attributes of Deity. Here *ai.* is used in the widest possible sense. The "*everlasting* covenant" of Gen. xvii., 7, 13, 19, and Lev. xxiv., 8, the "*everlasting* possession" of Gen. xvii., 8, and the "*perpetual* statute" of Lev. xxiv., 9, although thought of as not liable to overthrow, could not but be recognised as having a possible end. "The earth with her bars closed upon me *forever*" is the way in which Jonah speaks of his brief confinement in the belly of the sea-monster (Jon. ii., 6; LXX., ii., 7). Equally far removed from the idea of endless duration is the meaning of *aionios* in Job. xxii., 15, "the *old* way"; Prov. xxii. 28, "the *ancient* landmark"; Is. lviii., 12, "the *old* waste places"; Is. lxiii., 11, "the days of *old*." In the LXX. of Job iii., 18, "*old* men" are "the *æonian* ones," and in xxi., 11, "*old* sheep" are "*æonian* sheep." (The "*eternal* hills" of Hab. iii., 6, reappear in Tennyson, *In Memoriam*, xxxv., as "æonian hills" wasted away by descending floods.)

\* While it is true that the Revisers in substituting "is guilty of" for "is in danger of" gave to *ἐνοχος* (*ēnōchōs*) a meaning of which it is susceptible, this is, nevertheless, neither its primitive meaning nor its most common signification in the N. T. "*Held or bound by, hence liable, subject to,*" is Liddell and Scott's statement of the force of the word, and they do not give *guilty* as one of its definitions. So Thayer says that one is *ἐνοχος* "who is *held* in anything, so that he cannot escape; *bound, under obligation, subject to, liable.*"

his sin. With these corrections of the text and translation, it is the teaching of the passage that one so depraved as wilfully to pervert the truth by calling good evil is likely to continue indefinitely in sin, so hopeless is his case—so unlikely is he to reform.

### § 67. THE SIGN OF JONAH.

*Matt. xii., 38-42; Luke xi., 29-32.*

The connection between this section and what has gone before is somewhat closer in the First Gospel than in the Third, and Luke mentions no occasion for what Jesus here says except the assembling of the multitudes. However, as Matthew also in verse 46 represents Jesus as *yet speaking to the multitudes*, the difference between the two consists chiefly in the absence from Luke of the request from some of the scribes and Pharisees for a sign. The sign which was desired must have been something of a more remarkable character than the wonderful cures which Jesus had already performed: these they did not recognise as furnishing evidence of a divine mission, since almost any rabbi could cure some kinds of disease.<sup>1</sup> Jesus declares that they already have their sign in the story of Jonah, and that he will give them no other. Reading the book of Jonah we should understand Jesus to mean, if we had only Luke's report to guide us, that, as the preaching of the prophet was a condemnatory sign to the inhabitants of Nineveh, so were his own words and deeds a warning sign to his equally wicked countrymen; but Matthew's 40th verse introduces an altogether different idea, instituting a prophetic parallel between the three days and three nights spent by Jonah in the sea-monster and the time which was to intervene between the death and the resurrection of Jesus (*a*). Except for this verse Matthew

<sup>1</sup> In the similar passage, Matt. xvi., 1, the Pharisees and Sadducees ask for a sign "from heaven."

and Luke would make the same impression upon us ; for both refer to the repentance of the Ninevites at the preaching of Jonah, and both call attention to the fact that the impending crisis announced by Jesus is more serious than that with which the old prophet had to deal. The third chapter of the book of Jonah tells of the repentance of the Ninevites. The *queen of the south* is the Queen of Sheba, a part of Arabia, whose visit to Solomon is described in the tenth chapter of the first book of Kings. It is not Solomon who is contrasted with Jesus and declared to have been inferior to him, but it is the wisdom of Solomon which is placed below the teaching of the Gospel.

## NOTE.

(a, p. 152) It cannot be considered certain that by *the heart of the earth* is meant the tomb in which the body of Jesus was laid ; in fact the expression seems inappropriate as applied to an Oriental rock-tomb but slightly if at all depressed below the level of the surrounding soil. It is not unlikely that the reference is to Hades, the world of departed spirits, usually thought of as being below the earth ; for the Pauline epistles represent Jesus as having arisen from this underworld.\* A more striking incongruity appears when we compare the *three days and three nights* of the prophecy with data of time derived from the story of the Passion. It is said that the body of Jesus was taken from the cross and placed in the tomb toward evening on Friday, and that early on Sunday morning the sepulchre was found to be empty. This period of one day and two nights can by no legitimate process of reckoning be made equivalent to three days and three nights. Since it is to be presumed that, if Jesus was able to foresee his resurrection and to foretell the time of its occurrence, any prediction which he might make concerning it would be free from error, there are good critics who maintain that Matthew's explanation of the "sign of Jonah" did not originate with Jesus himself, but is an unskilful interpretation of a

\* See particularly Eph. iv., 9, where the form of expression, "the lower parts of the earth," reminds us of Matthew's phrase.

later date than the incident here recorded. This conclusion is strengthened by the absence of the explanation from the parallel passage, Matt. xvi., 4, where, although the words are found in a different connection, it would seem that there is just as much need of the explanation as in the present instance. It is also difficult to understand Luke's overlooking of the words if genuine.\*

### § 68. OF BACKSLIDING.

*Matt. xii., 43-45 ; Luke xi., 24-26.*

In Matthew there is a fairly good connection with the preceding paragraph. Jesus compares his generation to a man who, after having been for a time free from demoniacal possession, again comes under its influence more completely than before. Some temporary improvement of the Jewish people seems to be referred to, perhaps their giving up of idolatry, which had been followed in later times by the growth of a lifeless formalism destructive of vital religious faith. They were still an *adulterous*, *i. e.*, unfaithful generation (verse 39), because, although professing to worship the true God, they neglected their most important moral and religious duties.<sup>1</sup> The details of the simile rest upon popular Jewish conceptions. Deserts were supposed to be the natural home of demons, to which they returned when driven out of human bodies, where they preferred to dwell. The typical demon of the present passage speaks of the human body

\* Cp. Davidson's *Introd. to the N. T.* (1848), i., 88-90; Strauss's *Life of Jesus*, § 114; Hase's *Life of Jesus*, § 86; Neander's *Life of Christ*, § 165; Norton's *Genuineness of the Gospels*, add. Note A; *The Bible for Learners*, iii., 302, 303 = *The Bible for Young People*, v., 387, 388; Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii., 200; Ladd's *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, i., 65-68.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. the gloomy picture painted by Josephus: *Jewish Wars*, v., 10, 5 and 13. 6; vii., 8. 1.

which he proposes to reoccupy as his *house*. When, after a period of comparative calm and self-possession, the paroxysms of demonism returned with increased violence—a not unusual phenomenon of intermittent insanity—it was said that the demon had come back and brought other tormenting spirits with him. By *seven* is meant several.<sup>1</sup> Luke makes no application of these words of Jesus to the Jewish people, but takes them literally and connects them with the discourse concerning the casting out of evil spirits (§ 66). The phraseology of the two evangelists in this section would be almost identical were it not for Luke's omission of Matthew's last verse.

#### § 69. THE TRUE FAMILY OF JESUS.

*Matt. xii., 46-50 ; Mark iii., 31-35 ; Luke viii., 19-21, xi., 27, 28.*

There is not a word in any one of the Gospels indicating that Jesus refused to see his mother and his brothers and sisters when they asked for him. He simply takes advantage of a favourable opportunity for declaring that spiritual ties are closer than those of kindred (*a*).

#### NOTE.

(*a*, p. 155) From very early times various efforts have been made to affix to the word "brother" in this passage an unusual meaning. It is true that *adēlphōs*,\* like its Hebrew equivalent, has a fluctuating connotation ; but a common parentage is always implied by the word, unless the context suggests a different idea. Now "brothers" and "sisters" of Jesus are repeatedly spoken of in the New Testament without ever a suggestion that they are not children of Joseph and Mary. To imagine them to have been either

<sup>1</sup> For the history of the number seven see Hadley's *Essays*, 325-345.

\* ἀδελφός.



cousins of Jesus, or children of Joseph by a former marriage, is to invent facts for a dogmatic purpose. When Jesus had come to be deified and Mary to be spoken of as the immaculate "Mother of God," it was thought incredible that she should also have been the mother of ordinary children. It is in the Roman Catholic Church that this view has chiefly prevailed, and recent Protestant commentators very generally reject it.\* The two isolated verses of Luke which form a fitting pendant to this section stand in his Gospel just before the sign of Jonah. The connective adverb which introduces the reply of Jesus to the woman suggests a correction and enlargement of her statement, not a denial of its truth. *The word of God* is the will and law of God made known by His prophets, but especially by Jesus.† The phrase is very seldom used in the New Testament except by Luke.

#### § 70. THE PARABLE OF THE SEED-SOWING.

*Matt. xiii., 1-9 ; Mark iv., 1-9 ; Luke viii., 4-8.*

This is one of the three parables found in all the Synoptics. It is peculiar, but not unique, in being accompanied by an explanation and in being significant in all its parts instead of but a single one. While in the usual narrative form, it is descriptive not of something thought of as transpiring once for all, but of a typical event representing an oft-repeated and familiar occurrence. The scene is a field ready for sowing, separated from contiguous fields only by narrow beaten paths. The seed, thrown broadcast by the hand of the sower, does not all find lodgment in congenial soil. That which falls upon the hard-trodden path is at once snatched up by the birds ; the rest sprouts and grows, but with varying results. Where there is little earth thinly covering a ledge of rock, the tender shoots wither and die ;

\* Consult Thayer, 10.

† Cp. Matt. xii., 50 ; Mark iii., 35 ; Luke viii., 21.

where the ground is already full of noxious seeds' the good grain, crowded and imperfectly nourished, fails to bear fruit ; but some, in soil deep, rich, and clean, produces bountifully. The significance of the different parts of the parable is detailed in § 72.

### § 71. REASON FOR SPEAKING IN PARABLES.

*Matt. xiii., 10-17; Mark iv., 10-12; Luke viii., 9, 10, x., 23, 24.*

That Jesus should adopt story-telling as his mode of addressing the crowds who had gathered to hear him seems strange to his disciples, and they ask the reason for it. His answer is, in substance, that the people would not understand his teaching if he spoke to them otherwise. This reply, however, is couched in language not to be understood without reference to certain Hebrew conceptions and forms of speech. As reported by Mark and Luke Jesus seems to declare that the purpose of his public teaching is to prevent those who hear him from understanding his meaning ; but if so, why speak at all ? In reality a *limited* purpose is indicated—to enlighten the minds of his hearers to the extent to which they are capable of comprehending the nature of his mission. To do this it was necessary to conceal from them at first the altogether irrational character of their conception of the Messianic kingdom, since otherwise they would not have been willing to listen to him at all. The condition of ultimate success was to proceed slowly. In order to implant in the minds of his countrymen the fundamental idea that the establishment of the divine kingdom was not to be a sudden and startling event, but was to come about by a slow process of growth, he calls their attention to the ordinary workings of nature, seeming, perhaps, not to speak at all of

<sup>1</sup> The seeds of some prickly plant like the thistle.

spiritual things, although his hidden purpose was to lead them to recognise the operation of natural law in the spiritual world. Not yet were they aware that the kingdom of heaven was primarily a kingdom of the Spirit, and this transformation of their thought must itself needs be a process of slow growth. Matthew merely states the fact of the intellectual and spiritual dulness of the people, without intimating that it was the purpose of Jesus in his public instruction to veil from them the truth (*a*). The word "mystery," which is found nowhere else in the Gospels, though occurring frequently elsewhere in the New Testament, does not mean, in Biblical usage, something difficult or impossible to understand (like the later doctrines of the trinity and transubstantiation), but only some hidden truth—here the truth that the kingdom of God is to grow, not to come as an event. While the last two verses of the section in Matthew and Luke are identical in thought and very similar in form, they stand in their respective Gospels in very different connections. If the words were spoken but once, Luke seems to give them the better position.

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 158) Besides quoting freely from Is. vi., 9, as do Mark and Luke, Matthew gives the 10th verse in full in the very words of the LXX., which do not accurately represent the Hebrew.\* The last words of the quotation, which Mark also has in substance, are conceived in the true spirit of Hebrew determinism, which allows nothing to happen except in accordance with the predetermining will of God. Thus, even the perverseness and unbelief of the people of Israel are spoken of as though they were not merely the sequence but the intended result of the prophetic warning. It is not unlikely that these last words, which seem altogether unsuitable in their application to the teaching of Jesus, and which Luke, by omitting, seems to recognise as thus unsuitable, were brought into the other Gospels, not of any set purpose, but

\* See Toy, 37-39.

almost by chance, because of their forming a part of the passage which was quoted for the sake of its earlier portions.

§ 72. JESUS INTERPRETS THE PARABLE OF  
THE SEED-SOWING.

*Matt. xiii., 18-23 ; Mark iv., 13-20 ; Luke viii., 11-15.*

This explanation is somewhat differently introduced by the three evangelists. Matthew makes Jesus offer it of his own accord, introducing it with a "therefore" and an emphatic "ye": "Do *ye* therefore [*i. e.*, since I have spoken to the people blindly] hear [*i. e.*, listen to the explanation of] the parable of the one who sowed." In Mark it is not possible to tell from the Greek whether Jesus said, "You know not this parable," or, "Do you not know this parable?" Luke represents him as saying, in answer to the question asked by the disciples in verse 9, "Now this is the [meaning of the] parable." The key to the whole explanation is given in the words of Mark, "The sower [in the parable] sows [not with literal seed but] the word,"—Matthew has *the word of the kingdom* and Luke *the word of God*. All through the section there is confusion in the language, those in whose hearts the seed is sown, and who therefore should properly be represented by the different kinds of soil, being repeatedly spoken of as that which is sown.<sup>1</sup> From the fact that Jesus makes the birds which pick up the grain by the roadside to be typical of Satan (Matthew has *the evil one* and Luke *the devil*), the belief of Jesus in the personality of the devil cannot be certainly inferred. With all their dulness the disciples could hardly fail to see, after so much of explanation had been given, that the sower was Jesus himself and that the seed sown was his teaching concerning the kingdom of heaven.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. 2 Esdr. viii., 41.

### § 73. OF RECEIVING AND COMMUNICATING KNOWLEDGE.

*Mark iv., 21-25 ; Luke viii., 16-18.*

These paragraphs form a sort of corollary to the teaching of the three preceding sections.<sup>1</sup> In explaining the parable of the seed-sowing Jesus had, as it were, placed upon the lamp-stand the lighted lamp which had before been covered from sight. Generalising this object-lesson he affirms the law that all hiding looks to a subsequent revealing. Only temporarily and for a specific purpose is anything kept concealed. Making application of this teaching to the disciples and their mission as heralds of the truth, he urges upon them the duty of listening and learning well. And here he states a law of mental growth: in proportion to what we acquire and communicate is our ability to gain more, and not to make use of the little knowledge which we have is to lose even that little. Here not to go forward is to go backward.

### § 74. THE PARABLE OF THE TARES IN THE GRAIN-FIELD.

*Matt. xiii., 24-30.*

As in the preceding parable it is not the sower but the results of the sowing from which a lesson is sought to be drawn, so here, although *the kingdom of heaven* is said to be like a man who *sowed good seed in his field*, the real term of comparison is more complex, including the sowing of the *tares*<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Lyman Abbott calls this section the "Parable of the candle." The language is doubtless parabolic, but its non-narrative form and its subordination to the previous context stand in the way of its being considered an independent parable.

<sup>2</sup> "Tares" is not an altogether suitable term by which to represent the Gr. ζιζάνια (*zizania*), but it is not easy to find a better. Some

as well, and the growing together of both wheat and tares *until the harvest*. If any one of these elements is of more importance than the rest it is the simple presence of the tares among the wheat.<sup>1</sup>

## § 75. THE PARABLE OF THE SELF-GROWTH OF THE SEED.

*Mark iv., 26-29.*

This third parable of seed-sowing fixes attention upon the silent and unobserved development of the germ, the stalk, the ear, and the ripening grain. Other titles which have been given to the parable are "The land producing by itself," "The fruit-bearing earth," "The blade, the ear, and the full corn," "The seed growing secretly." These differences of designation indicate a lack of agreement as to the main purpose of the parable. The first of these titles, although similar to the one standing at the head of the section, places emphasis upon the stimulating and sustaining power of the soil rather than upon the vitality of the seed. In the first of the seed-parables it is the difference in the soils in which the seed of truth is sown that is emphasised, although in subordination to the general idea of the development instead of the establishment of the divine kingdom : now the specific thought is that this kingdom "cometh not with observation."<sup>2</sup> The seed of truth is sown in the hearts

would substitute for it "darnel" and others the newly coined "zizany" or "zizan." The plant in question does not belong to the botanical genus *Zizania*, which includes only certain aquatic grasses. If any change is to be made in the rendering, "darnel" should doubtless be adopted.

<sup>1</sup> The interpretation of the parable, as given by Jesus himself, is found in § 79.

<sup>2</sup> Luke xvii., 20.

of men, and there it takes root, no power from without controlling and no eye seeing the process of growth whose fruitage is the character upon which the sower will one day sit in judgment.<sup>1</sup>

## § 76. THE PARABLE OF THE MUSTARD-SEED.

*Matt. xiii., 31, 32; Mark iv., 30-32; Luke xiii., 18, 19.*

Not yet has Jesus exhausted the instruction to be derived from the process of growth in the vegetable world. Here, however, the lesson is derived not from the broadcast sowing of grain, but from the careful planting of a single small seed—exaggeratedly spoken of as the very smallest of seeds.<sup>2</sup> The place of planting is in Mark vaguely “the ground,” in Matthew “the field” of the planter, and in Luke “his garden.”<sup>3</sup> As the smallness of the seed was exaggerated, so is the size of the herb when it is spoken of in Matthew as becoming *a tree*.<sup>4</sup> The wonderful growth of the kingdom of heaven from the smallest beginnings is the lesson intended to be taught (*a*).

<sup>1</sup> Some critics of repute look upon this parable, but without adequate reason, as only a modification of the parable of the tares in the grain-field.

<sup>2</sup> What species of mustard is referred to cannot be determined, although there are growing in Palestine at the present day plants of the mustard family which answer well to the description given by the evangelists.

<sup>3</sup> *His field* and *his own garden* can hardly be limited, as is done by some, to the people of Israel, since, in his explanation of the parable of the tares, Jesus says (Matt. xiii., 38) that “the field is the world.”

<sup>4</sup> Yet in the Jerusalem Talmud one writes: “A stalk of mustard was in my field, into which I was wont to climb, as men are wont to climb into a fig-tree”; and in another place a mustard-plant is spoken of, one of whose branches, when broken off, covered the tent of a potter.

## NOTE.

(a, p. 162) The gathering of the birds under the shade and in the branches of the mustard-tree suggests nothing of itself beyond the great size of the plant and the denseness of its foliage—circumstances simply heightening the pictorial effect of the description ; but Goebel (*The Parables of Jesus*, 98, 99) cites remarkably coincident passages from Ezekiel and Daniel which lead him to infer that the language of Jesus would be understood by his hearers as a “ definite promise that the kingdom of God in its extension will embrace the nations, that the nations of the earth will enter in and partake of its blessings.”

## § 77. THE PARABLE OF THE LEAVEN.

*Matt. xiii., 33 ; Luke xiii., 20-21.*

Other considerations apart, the closeness of the connection between this parable and the preceding one is favourable to the supposition that the two teach substantially the same lesson. It will follow from this that the *meal*<sup>1</sup> which receives the *leaven* is the world, and that the leaven is the word as presented to the world by Jesus and his disciples. In the preceding parable it is the great expansiveness of the kingdom which is typified by the wonderful development of the mustard-seed ; here it is rather the power of divine truth to diffuse and communicate itself which is represented by the working of the leaven. While the parable may easily lend itself to a more individual and personal application, indicating the power of truth over the mind and heart of man, yet nothing in the record favours such a restriction of the meaning of the passage ; nevertheless, as the whole is but the sum of the parts, the world is saved only through the salvation of individual men and women.

<sup>1</sup> “ Three measures ” (*sata*) of meal, equal to a Jewish *ephah* and the English “ bushel,” seem to have been the usual quantity for a single large baking (see Gen. xviii., 6 ; Judg. vi., 19 ; 1 Sam. i., 24).



# § 78. THE PARABOLIC METHOD OF THE TEACHING OF JESUS.

*Matt. xiii., 34, 35; Mark iv., 33, 34.*

Mark's statement that Jesus spoke *the word* concerning the coming kingdom in parables *as they* [the multitude] *were able to hear it* implies that the people were incapable of being instructed in any other way. This has reference only to what may be called the esoteric doctrine of Jesus concerning the true nature of the Messianic kingdom, which he fully explained only to his immediate disciples in private. Matthew adds a quotation from the 78th Psalm<sup>1</sup> which he considers prophetic of this manner of teaching. The original passage is not strictly applicable to the parables of Jesus, since the Hebrew word<sup>2</sup> of which "parable" is here the translation does not denote a similitude of any kind, but, as used by the Psalmist, has reference only to the ancient history of the people of Israel of which he proposes to speak (*a*).

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 164) The parallelism of the original makes this plain. Toy translates, "I will open my mouth in a parable, I will utter riddles out of the olden times." The first half of Matthew's quotation is in the exact words of the LXX., while in the second half the two have not a single word in common.

Of the 78th Psalm Wellhausen says: "This Psalm is a poetical Midrash, or popular exposition of the History of Israel." \*

<sup>1</sup> According to Tischendorf's text the passage is ascribed to "the prophet Isaiah."

<sup>2</sup> *mashal*.

\* *Polychrome Edition of the Bible*, pt. xiv., 196.

## § 79. JESUS INTERPRETS THE PARABLE OF THE TARES IN THE GRAIN-FIELD.

*Matt. xiii., 36-43.*

This is a detailed explanation of the parable of § 74, and especially of its concluding portion, as given at the request of the disciples.<sup>1</sup> By *the sons of the kingdom* are meant the righteous—those prepared for citizenship in the heavenly kingdom, who are contrasted with the wicked—*the sons of the evil one.*<sup>2</sup> The statement that the sons of the kingdom are the good seed is not what we should expect, since what Jesus sowed was the seeds of truth, which found lodgment in the hearts of his disciples. *Sperma*,<sup>3</sup> *seed*, must then be looked upon as potentially including that which springs from it, the thought of the passage being richer than its language.

In verse 39 the Revisers' marginal reading *the consummation of the age* is much preferable to *the end of the world*. What is signified by the Greek is the rounding up or bringing to an end of some process which has been going on, not the destruction of some existing thing. Here it is the

<sup>1</sup> In this passage the R. V. rightly substitutes "explain" for "declare" (A. V.) as the equivalent of *φράσων* (*phrasōn*), although retaining the old rendering in xv., 15—the only other place where the word is found in the N. T. The verb occurs in the Septuagint of Job vi., 24, where the Hebrew is rendered by the Revisers "cause to understand," and xii., 8, where the R. V. has "teach." This is the preponderating Homeric meaning of *φράζω*, which gradually came to be used in the more general sense of to "tell" or "declare." In the present passage some MSS. and editions read *διαβάφῃον* = "explain." In the opinion of a few modern critics the explanation given in this section is to be ascribed to some disciple rather than to the Master.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. John viii., 44 ; 1 John iii., 8, 10.

<sup>3</sup> *σπέρμα*.

conclusion <sup>1</sup> of the pre-Messianic order—the present *agor*,<sup>2</sup> of which it had been said that “the day of judgment shall be the end of this time.”<sup>3</sup> This is the Messianic judgment, when the world-harvest will be ripe for gathering—a time which Jesus later seems to connect in some way with the destruction of Jerusalem. In verses 41–43 a complete separation of the righteous from the wicked is plainly intended, but the phraseology used appears to be at least in part figurative. The “furnace,” or the “fiery furnace,” as a symbol of tribulation and suffering, is of frequent occurrence in the Old Testament.<sup>4</sup> So deeply was this figure imbedded in the speech of the Hebrews that for many centuries no other was able to supplant it as an image of human suffering under the divine retribution. Although tares, when gathered and burned, would be, to all appearance, utterly consumed, it would be forcing the explanation of the parable, by placing upon a mere incidental circumstance a stress not intended, to make it teach the utter destruction of the wicked. Especially is such an interpretation hazardous in view of the fact that the furnace of fire is ordinarily symbolic of suffering which ends in purification and not in destruction, just as the precious metals are freed from their dross in the furnace of the refiners. Moreover, *weeping and gnashing of teeth* (verse 42) implies the continuance of sensuous existence.<sup>5</sup> The felicity of the righteous is described in verse 43 in apocalyptic language.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *συντέλεια* (*suntēlēia*). Cp. Matt. xiii., 49, xxiv., 3, xxviii., 20; Heb. ix., 26. In the Septuagint of Exodus, xxiii., 16, *ἡ* is applied to the ingathering of the fruits of the field in the time of harvest.

<sup>2</sup> *αἶων*, not *κόσμος*, of which “world” is the rendering in verse 38. See § 66 (*a*), p. 150.

<sup>3</sup> 4 (R. V. 2) Esd. vii., 43.

<sup>4</sup> See Ezek. xxii., 17–22; Deut. iv., 20; 1 Kings viii., 51; Is. xlvi., 10; Jer. xi., 4; Prov. xvii., 3, xxvii., 21.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. Matt. viii., 12.

<sup>6</sup> Cp. Dan. xii., 3.

# § 80. THE PARABLES OF THE TREASURE AND THE PEARL.

*Matt. xiii., 44-46.*

The parables of this section and the following one appear to have been addressed to the disciples only and not to the multitudes. There is no essential difference in the teaching of the first two: they are both intended to illustrate the supreme value of the heavenly riches, for the possession of which all else should be sacrificed. In the second, however, there is an added element; for whereas the one who found the treasure in the field happened upon it by chance, the merchantman made diligent search for the costly pearl. The incident of the hiding of the treasure conveys no lesson but is only a part of the drapery of the story. Treasure-trove, among the Jews, belonged to the person upon whose premises it was found. The finder, in the parable, refrains from making known the fact of his discovery until he has purchased the field and so secured a legal title to all that it contains. With the ethical question suggested by this proceeding the parable has nothing to do.

# § 81. THE PARABLE OF THE SEINE.

*Matt. xiii., 47-50.*

Between the parable of the seine or drag-net <sup>1</sup> and that of the tares in the grain-field there is this likeness,—that both set forth the fact that among those ostensibly within the Messianic kingdom will be found many who have there no rightful place. The final separation of the wheat from the tares is paralleled by the separation of the good fish from the bad. If stress is to be laid upon the original meaning

<sup>1</sup> *σαγήνη* (*sagēnē*), from which is derived the English *seine*.

of the word translated *bad*,<sup>1</sup> we should substitute for this generic term some more specific phrase descriptive of fish already dead and decaying, types of Christian disciples whose faith is dead. It is the same word which in Matt. vii., 17, and xii., 33, is used to describe the decayed tree and its worthless fruit. When it is said that the net gathered of *every kind* of fish, it is implied that all sorts of men professed the Christian faith, many of them without realising that they were taking upon themselves the obligation to lead an upright life.

## § 82. CONCLUSION OF PARABOLIC TEACHING.

*Matt. xiii., 51, 52.*

The affirmative answer of the disciples to the question of Jesus whether they have understood his explanation of the parable of the tares (which they had asked for) and the three following parables leads to the intimation that such training as they are receiving through their association with him will better fit them for becoming teachers of men. The *therefore* of verse 52 has not the strict illative force which belongs to formal logic, but serves rather to introduce a development of the content of the preceding *yea*. If the twelve could understand these teachings, so could others. He who is compared to the householder is any disciple who, having learned from Jesus the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, communicates them freely to others. The word *scribe* is diverted from its usual narrow meaning, as again in Matt. xxiii., 34. So *the kingdom of heaven* is here put rhetorically for him who announces the advent of this kingdom and summons men to prepare for its coming. In this way the personality of Jesus is thrown into the background and subordinated to the object of his mission. The "new things and old" have been

<sup>1</sup> σαπρός, *sapros*.

variously understood. So much seems clear,—that there is a reference to the new form of the parabolic utterances of Jesus, which his disciples would be able to use in their teaching along with the customary methods of instruction. There may be a reference to the subject-matter of the teachings as well.

### § 83. THE STORM ON THE LAKE.

*Matt. viii., 18, 23-27; Mark iv., 35-41; Luke viii., 22-25.*

With not a few verbal differences the three evangelists tell substantially the same story of a storm on the lake, which ceases at the command of Jesus. Now for the first time is he represented as having control over the forces of inanimate nature. What Mark and Luke describe by its cause as a *storm of wind* Matthew, noting its effect, speaks of as a “commotion”<sup>1</sup> of the waves. The Sea of Galilee, being depressed below the level of the surrounding country, is subject to sudden and violent storms caused by the wind rushing down upon the lake through the many ravines along its banks. These tempests are usually of no long duration (*a*).

#### NOTE.

(*a*, p. 169) Of those who are not able to accept this account as veritable history some look upon it as pure myth and others as a legend based upon fact. It is the essence of the former explanation to think of the narrative as an ideal representation of the spiritual power of Jesus over the minds of his disciples, by which he allays their anxious fears. If the story has a basis in outward fact, then its present form is thought of as having originated in a misconception of the language of Jesus, what he said to his companions really having had no relation to the subsiding of the storm.\*

<sup>1</sup> σεισμός (*seismōs*), a shaking,—a term elsewhere in the N. T. applied only to earthquakes.

\* Cp. Virgil's poetical conception of Neptune with similar effect chiding the winds and waves for invading his domain.—*Æneid*, i., 124-143.

§ 84. THE DEMONIAK AND THE HERD OF SWINE.<sup>1</sup>

*Matt. viii., 28-34 ; Mark v., 1-20 ; Luke viii., 26-39.*

Combining the three Synoptic accounts of this most striking case of demoniacism we get the following narrative. Crossing the Sea of Galilee Jesus and his companions land upon the eastern shore. As they disembark they are met by a demoniac—Matthew says by two, and the others make their one testify to his possession by many demons (*a*). Matthew and Mark represent the man (or men) as coming *out of the tombs*, but Luke says *from the city*. As burial-places were quite commonly just outside of city walls, there is here no great discrepancy. All the accounts represent the man (or men) as under the influence of uncontrollable mania. Jesus does not heed the protest of the demons against being driven out of their present abode, but does yield to their request that, if driven out, they may be allowed to enter into a herd of swine which is feeding thereabouts. The swine, when entered by the demons, rush down<sup>2</sup> into the sea and are drowned. The man is afterwards found sitting at the feet of Jesus, *clothed and in his right mind*.<sup>3</sup>

The symptoms of demoniacism in this case are strongly

<sup>1</sup> With Matthew in the first sentence reading "Gadarenes," Mark "Gerasenes," and Luke either "Gergasenes" or "Gerasenes" (MSS. vary), it is hardly proper to speak of the "Gadarene" demoniac, as is sometimes done, or, with Holtzmann and Huck, of the "Gerasene."

<sup>2</sup> There is at the supposed place of this incident nothing which we should call a *mountain* (see Mark and Luke), but only a bluff.

<sup>3</sup> The verb *ἵναριζω*, meaning "to clothe," being found nowhere in any literature excepting in the present passage, where it is common to Mark and Luke, this fact tends to confirm the idea of a genetic connection between these two Gospels. The two also have other prominent words in common,

marked. The man was exceedingly violent and all efforts to restrain him had proved futile ; he lived apart from men, not in any house but among the tombs and in the mountains ; he had not for a long time worn any clothing ; he was constantly uttering harsh cries and cutting himself with stones. Mark and Luke, with but slightly varying phraseology, make the demoniac beseech Jesus not to torment him ; and they assign as the cause of this solicitude the previous command of Jesus to the unclean spirit that he should come out of the man. Matthew, on the other hand, says nothing about such an injunction, but simply makes the demoniac ask, " Did you come here to torment us before the proper time ? " <sup>1</sup> Mark and Luke also mention the additional circumstance that the supposed demon, or the man in whom the demon was, on being asked his name, said that it was *Legion*,—by which was indicated the presence in the man's body not merely of one evil spirit but of many. According to Mark the spirits begged Jesus not to send them out of the country ; according to Luke they besought him that he would not order them to go away *into the abyss*, that is, the place of punishment to which they knew that they were destined. The three evangelists agree in saying that the demons asked to be allowed to enter the herd of swine, although Matthew alone explicitly states the condition left by the others to be implied, " if you send us out." We have here the phenomenon of a man uttering words which purport to come from an intelligence not his own but yet enthroned in his body. This usurping spirit (or legion of spirits) speaks as though he were aware that his present stolen habitation was only a temporary one, from which sooner or later he would be driven. He is represented as recognising in Jesus that Son of God through whose power he is to be sent to his deserved punishment (*b*). See Appendix F.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Mark i., 24 ; Luke iv., 34.



## NOTES.

(a, p. 170) Tradition is more likely to have enlarged the number than to have diminished it.\* Upon the whole Matthew shows no tendency to magnify the story, but, on the contrary, abridges the ample narrative of Mark by omitting unimportant though picturesque details. Luke, while presumably writing latest of all, is able to add nothing to the story as told by his predecessors, although he departs somewhat from the order of Mark, whose account he substantially reproduces.

(b, p. 171) On the supposition of the reality of demoniacal possession, the destruction of the herd of swine needs no explanation, although it may seem to require justification, since, if Jesus had absolute control over the demons, they might as well have been sent elsewhere as into the bodies of the swine, and the swine might have been prevented from rushing into the sea. If, on the other hand, we have to deal only with a case of violent insanity, there is no difficulty in supposing that the wild gestures and ejaculations of the demoniac caused a panic in the herd of swine, which, according to their wont, rushed blindly in the direction which seemed to afford the readiest way of escape. It is only Matthew who makes the swine to have been *a long way off*—an expression too vague and indefinite to furnish any serious objection to the above hypothesis. Mark explicitly and Luke by fair implication says that Jesus met the demoniac upon the shore of the lake immediately upon landing. Baur's mythical interpretation of the story makes the cure of the demoniac to be representative of the conversion of the Gentiles. This is upon the supposition that the man was not a Jew,—a point incapable of being determined.

\* May not some of the feeders of the swine, who would not be near enough to Jesus and the possessed man to know what was passing between them, have taken Jesus for a second demoniac and so reported when *they fled and told it* [the story] *in the city and in the country*? See Luke viii., 34.

## § 85. THE DAUGHTER OF JAIRUS, AND THE WOMAN WITH AN ISSUE OF BLOOD.

*Matt. ix., 18-26 ; Mark v., 21-43 ; Luke viii., 40-56.*

In Matthew Jairus<sup>1</sup> is called simply "a ruler" (*archōn*), in Mark "one of the synagogue-rulers," in Luke "ruler of the synagogue," probably equivalent to "the ruler of the synagogue." The reference appears to be to the chief director of the synagogue worship. The three narrators differ here somewhat more than usual in the length of their narratives. Matthew's very concise account may be either an abridgment of that of Mark or it may have been derived from another and possibly an oral source. While he represents the ruler as himself announcing the death of his daughter, according to Mark the father, said "My little daughter is near her end," and according to Luke she was dying. Both Mark and Luke make the news of her death to have been brought later by a messenger or messengers from the father's house. These differences are immaterial, since all three of the evangelists represent the maiden as having died before the arrival of Jesus, and even according to Matthew's account the father said that she had but just died (*a*).

On the way to the house of Jairus a cure is performed upon a woman who has pressed forward through the crowd to touch the garments of Jesus in the confident hope of being relieved thereby from a malady of long standing. Matthew here, as in the narrative in which this incident is imbedded, is very much briefer than Mark and Luke, and especially than the former. From Matthew's simple and unadorned narrative we receive the impression that the change in the woman's physical condition was due solely to her belief that such healing power resided in the person of Jesus that to come into contact with him, even if only through the touching of his clothing, was enough to bring about a removal of

<sup>1</sup> The same name as *Jair* in Num. xxxii., 41 ; Judg. x., 3.

the disease. Jesus is represented as saying to her that the change in her condition, of which she is at once conscious, is to be ascribed to her confident expectation of relief. In Mark's account, to the faith of the woman is added an actual physical influence proceeding from the body of Jesus and effecting the cure, though not without his knowledge that such a draft has been made upon his healing power ; while Luke makes him say in so many words that he is aware that power has gone out of him (*b*).

#### NOTES.

(*a*, p. 173) The inferiority of Matthew's account appears in the way in which, perhaps as the result of condensation, some things are unnaturally brought together by him which in the fuller account of Mark fitly stand apart. Nothing could be more natural than that the ruler should ask Jesus to go and use for the preservation of the life of his daughter the wonderful healing power which he was reputed to possess ; but, unless we are to suppose that all unconsciousness, excepting that which accompanies normal sleep, was wont to be spoken of as death (*thanatos*), it is difficult to imagine that even the intense grief of the bereaved father should have so clouded his judgment as to lead him to think that Jesus had the unheard-of power of restoring life as well as of saving it. The Christian faith of later times is here attributed to one who gives no evidence of being in any sense a disciple of Jesus. Notwithstanding the evident belief of the evangelists that the maiden was really dead, they have preserved in the words of Jesus himself evidence that he believed her to be still alive ; for all three of the accounts report him as distinctly saying that she was not dead but asleep. Plummer is "content, with Hase [and several other critics of note], to admit that certainty is unattainable as to whether the maiden was dead or in a trance." \* If the idea of a resurrection from actual death is to be abandoned, it is possible, following the Tübingen and Modern Dutch schools, to think of a myth fashioned after Old Testament models ; but a more satisfactory basis of explanation is found in the Jewish custom of

\* *Int. Crit. Exeget. Com.* on Luke, 237.

burying upon the day of decease and the consequent liability to premature interment, supplemented by our better present knowledge of the laws of syncope.\* In Luke's 55th verse *pneuma* may as well be translated "breath" as "spirit."

(b, p. 174) It is doubtless the supposition of the evangelists that the cure so suddenly wrought was of permanent duration; but evidence upon this point is altogether lacking. Such affections often being subject to periodical recurrence, there may have been temporary relief without any permanent change of habit. The power of mind over body has received too many illustrations in modern times, notably in connection with the touching of the person of royalty for the cure of scrofulous diseases, or "king's evil,"† and in the "faith cures" of the present day, to make it necessary to discredit the reality of the relief of this trusting though superstitious woman.

## § 86. THE YOUNG MAN OF NAIN.

*Luke vii., 11-17.*

Nain appears to have been a small village of northern Galilee, situated on the slope of Little Hermon and still existing under the name of Nein. This is the only mention of it in the Bible.<sup>1</sup> Under *his disciples* Luke probably includes here, as in vi., 13, more than the twelve.<sup>2</sup> The translation *the Lord* should here, as generally elsewhere when

\* A concise summary of what is known by scientists concerning counterfeits of sleep and death may be found in an article copied from the *Fortnightly Review* into the *Popular Science Monthly* for September, 1887.

† "As late as when the Puritans were enunciating their lofty principles, it was generally held that the king's touch would cure scrofula." —Munger's *On the Threshold*, 127.

<sup>1</sup> Josephus speaks of another village of the same name but across the Jordan.

<sup>2</sup> This, of course, is certainly the case if we should retain the reading of the T. R. (*ἰκανός*, "a considerable number"), which Tisch. adopts on the authority of several good MSS.

Jesus is spoken of, give place to "master" or "teacher."<sup>1</sup> The word translated *bier*<sup>2</sup> should rather, as some think, be rendered "coffin,"<sup>3</sup> it being supposed that an open casket is meant. Jesus does not say that the young man is not dead, but he does address him just as one would naturally address a living person.

### § 87. IN THE SYNAGOGUE AT NAZARETH.

*Matt. xiii., 53-58; Mark vi., 1-6a; Luke iv., 16-30.*

From no other passage of the New Testament do we learn so much concerning the family of Jesus and his early occupation as from the contributions of Matthew and Mark to this section.<sup>4</sup> He is said by Mark to have been a carpenter; by Matthew, the son of a carpenter; and his mother is spoken of by both as Mary, his father's name not being mentioned (*a*). The names of four brothers are given, and sisters are also spoken of. (See § 69 (*a*).) That Jesus still frequents the sabbath assembly and even takes an active part in the conduct of its services shows that he is not as yet estranged from the worship of the synagogue,<sup>5</sup> but, on the contrary, finds in it his best opportunity for showing that his heart responds to the deepest religious feelings of his countrymen. Matthew and Mark only speak in a general way of his "teaching" in the synagogue; but Luke gives more particulars, saying that first of all he *stood up to read*

<sup>1</sup> See § 59, Note <sup>1</sup>, p. 135.

<sup>2</sup> *σποός, sōrōs*.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Gen. l., 26, where the LXX. have *σποός* and the R. V. "coffin." The word occurs nowhere else in the N. T.

<sup>4</sup> If it were settled beyond question, as it is not, that Luke had in mind the same occasion as Matthew and Mark, it would still have to be recognised that his sources were independent of theirs.

<sup>5</sup> It has been suggested that this statement of the evangelist may have rested upon and referred to what was afterwards the custom of Jesus. On the synagogue, see Appendix E.

from the Scriptures. This does not imply that there had not been the usual preliminary service, including a reading from the law. That he had been asked to read by someone in authority seems likely from the fact that this was the usual custom and that there was delivered unto him (not that he asked for) the book of the prophet Isaiah. Standing was the common posture in reading in the synagogue.<sup>1</sup> The "book" was in the form of a roll and was placed upon a reading-stand<sup>2</sup> and not held by the reader. The rods to which MSS. were fastened (usually at both ends) were furnished with handles for convenience of rolling up and unrolling.<sup>3</sup> Custom required that he who read from the prophets<sup>4</sup> should read not fewer than twenty-one verses; but one of the Talmudists says: "If there be an interpreter, or preaching, on the sabbath-day, they read out of the prophets three, five, or seven verses, and are not so careful to read just twenty-one."

Jesus took the liberty of selecting but two verses for his text, and of even omitting the last clause of the second verse.<sup>5</sup> Having finished his brief reading he hands the roll to the attendant from whom he had received it, and, according to custom,<sup>6</sup> resumes his seat before proceeding to address

<sup>1</sup> It was also considered a mark of disrespect to lean upon anything while reading; "for," said the rabbins, "as the law was given with reverence, so are we to handle it with reverence."

<sup>2</sup> Whence the *lectern* of Christian churches.

<sup>3</sup> Instead of *opened*, it would be better to say "unrolled" the book.

<sup>4</sup> He was called the *maphṭir*, and the portion read, the *haphṭara*.

<sup>5</sup> Although in Thayer's lexicon that interpretation is supported which makes Jesus to have alighted upon this passage by chance, not even so good an authority added to that of Meyer can make this exegesis either necessary or natural, since the verb *εὕρισκω*, "to find," means to find by searching as well as by chance, and the verses read are such as Jesus would be likely to choose for himself. Altogether savouring of Jewish superstition is Meyer's notion of a chance act directed by Divine Providence.

<sup>6</sup> From Acts xiii., 16, it would seem that one who had not previously been acting as reader might stand when speaking.

the assembly. The reading having been (almost certainly) from the Hebrew, which, being no longer a spoken language, few could understand, it was necessary to give the sense of it in the popular Aramaic speech (*b*). It is not explicitly stated and so cannot be affirmed with certainty that Jesus gave a paraphrase of the passage which he read: this may have been done by another. The words read are found, with slight exception, in Is. lxi., 1, 2. In its original setting the passage is a part of that extended section (ch. lix.-lxv.) in which deliverance is promised to the children of Israel in captivity. The prophet declares that he has been sent to announce the good news of "the acceptable year of the Lord," that is, the time which Jehovah has chosen for the release of His people from the hand of the oppressor. Jesus, borrowing the language of the prophet and giving to it a new meaning, announces the near coming of that kingdom of God the establishment of which shall deliver from a worse than Babylonian bondage.

Luke reports only the opening sentence of the address of Jesus, for the rest contenting himself with the statement that the people wondered that such excellent speech could come from the mouth of their unlettered townsman. Matthew and Mark add to this cause of their astonishment the wonderful works which they had heard of his doing. However, with the usual fickleness of popular assemblies, their favour soon changes into a decidedly hostile demonstration, the result of his claim, apparently so absurd, to be the divine messenger referred to in the passage of Scripture which he had just read. Luke's verses 23-27, with their partial parallels in the other Synoptics, furnished added cause of resentment. *Physician, heal thyself*<sup>1</sup> is capable of two explanations. The "physician" being Jesus, in strictness "thyself" should refer to him, the meaning being something like this: "Be

<sup>1</sup> A Hebrew proverb found, in somewhat varying forms, in the classical literature of both Greece and Rome.

somebody yourself before assuming to teach us. Make good your lofty claims by doing something.' But it is possible that the language is to be interpreted more freely, and that the following sentence is meant to be the explanation of *heal thyself*, Jesus thus for the moment identifying himself with the town to which he belonged. Verse 24 may seem to harmonise best with the former view, verses 25-27 with the latter. In verse 24 he declares that he is only having the common experience of prophets in being rejected by those among whom he has been brought up.<sup>1</sup> The historical parallels<sup>2</sup> which follow are his justification for not performing among them any of the wonderful works which they have heard of his doing in the city of Capernaum. There is nothing in the phraseology of Luke's 30th verse to indicate how it happened that Jesus was able to escape from the mob which apparently had him completely in its power.<sup>3</sup>

## NOTES.

(a, p. 176) The question said to have been asked by the Nazarenes is doubtless only a specimen of the kind of remarks which the people made to one another; yet it is conceivable that the failure to mention the name of the father of Jesus may have been due to the fact of his being no longer living at the time of this occurrence. If early tradition is correct in its assertion that Joseph was an old man when he married Mary, it is not improbable that his death took place before Jesus reached the age of manhood.

(b, p. 178) Even in the time of Ezra (see Neh. viii., 8)

<sup>1</sup> The recently discovered Oxyrhynchite papyrus, written before 300 A.D., has, "Jesus saith, A prophet is not acceptable in his own country, neither doth a physician work cures upon them that know him."

<sup>2</sup> See 1 Kings xvii., 1, xviii., 1; 2 Kings v., 1 ff. It is to be noticed that Luke adds six months to the duration of the drought.

<sup>3</sup> From the fact that Matthew says only that Jesus did not and Mark that he could not perform many wonderful works in Nazareth because the people had no faith in him, it is reasonably conjectured that Luke had sources of information peculiar to himself.



“they read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly [or, with an interpretation] ; and they gave the sense [or, caused them to understand] so that they understood the reading.” There was not, so far as we know, any Targum—*i. e.*, written translation or paraphrase—of any part of the Old Testament Scriptures before the middle of the second century of the Christian era ; and it is not likely that such a paraphrase, if in existence, would be allowed to take the place of the reading from the Hebrew. Nowhere else but in this passage is Jesus spoken of in the New Testament as reading. Some critics have thought that even on this occasion the regular synagogue reader read the passage and that Jesus only gave the exposition,—a supposition which implies that Luke hastily “assumed that, as Jesus expounded, he also read.” The words of the passage as given in our Gospel are taken almost verbatim from the Septuagint, which represents the Hebrew with sufficient accuracy.\*

#### § 88. THE SENDING OUT OF DISCIPLES.

*Matt. ix., 35-38, x., 1, 5-16 ; Mark vi., 6b-11 ; Luke ix., 1-5, x., 1-12, xiii., 22.*

Jesus continues his journeying, directing his course, according to Luke, toward Jerusalem. Matthew and Mark know of no other than a missionary purpose in his wanderings from place to place. Moving thus here and there among the people of Galilee and associating intimately with them he is impressed, as apparently never before, with their great need of help such as they had a right to expect, but did not receive, from those who were only in name their spiritual shepherds.<sup>1</sup> Again his imagination pictures them as a harvest-field waving with ripened grain ready for the sickle, and he urges his disciples to pray that there may be no lack

\* See Toy, 77-80.

<sup>1</sup> The figure of the neglected and scattered flock was familiar to all Jews through such passages as Num. xxvii., 17 ; 1 Kings xxii., 17 ; Ps. cxix., 176.

of labourers for the work. As for the twelve,<sup>1</sup> he authorises them to cast out demons and cure diseases.<sup>2</sup> In sending them out he gives them particular instructions as to their conduct. Matthew, in ch. x., connects with these instructions, which properly include only verses 5-16, much matter which in Luke has other relations. Luke's account of a separate sending out of seventy missionaries (x., 1 ff.), whether historical or not (and on this point there is a wide difference of opinion), has so much in common with the charge given at the commissioning of the twelve as reported by Matthew and Mark that the two narratives cannot well be considered apart (*a*). Luke says that Jesus sent the seventy *into every city and place whither he himself was about to come* according to Matthew he enjoined upon the twelve first of all not to go either among the Gentiles or into the half-Gentile region of Samaria.<sup>3</sup> Matthew and Luke agree as to the purpose for which the twelve were sent out, namely, *to preach the kingdom of God and to heal*; but the former gives more details and adds an injunction that, as what they had received had been to them a free gift,<sup>4</sup> so they should impart to others without demanding or even expecting any reward.<sup>5</sup> With regard to provision for the journey the three Synoptics agree substantially, though not altogether consistent with

<sup>1</sup> Luke amplifies the *authority* of Matthew and Mark to *power and authority*, as though the ability of the twelve to cure demoniacism was due to the training which they had received from their master.

<sup>2</sup> See Eccus. 1., 25, 26. Matthew nowhere else so much as mentions the Samaritans, and Mark does not speak of them at all. In the other Gospels the references to them are few.

<sup>3</sup> The specific acts said to have been enjoined are those which Jesus was later reported to have performed.

<sup>4</sup> "Freely" (E. V.) is to be understood in the sense of "gratuitously."

<sup>5</sup> On their appointment see § 33. From Matthew's Gospel we should not know that they had previously been selected by Jesus to be his special helpers.

one another in details. Matthew and Luke allow the carrying of a staff, which is prohibited in Mark. Matthew and Mark again disagree with regard to the wearing of sandals, which Luke mentions only in the instructions to the seventy. The gist of these precepts is that they shall not burden themselves with anything which might be considered an article of luxury rather than of necessity, but shall trust as far as possible to the hospitality of those among whom they are to labour. Especially they are to take with them neither food, nor money<sup>1</sup> with which to buy it, nor superfluous clothing. In Luke it is added, in the instructions to the seventy, that they are to salute no one by the way,—a precaution against the frittering away of valuable time in idle gossip. Mark and Luke report briefly but Matthew more fully the instructions of Jesus to the twelve as to their conduct upon entering any city or village. According to Matthew they are to exercise discretion as to the person with whom they shall take up their abode. Having once selected their host, they are to abide with him as long as they remain in that place. Upon entering the house the usual friendly salutation, "Peace be to this house,"<sup>2</sup> is not to be forgotten. Luke gives all this most fully in the instructions to the seventy. By *a son of peace* is meant one who is friendly and worthy of being accepted as a host. By their salutation returning to them in case it is not reciprocated is meant that their words are to be as though they had not been spoken,—are to be unsaid, as it were,—which would be evidenced by their leaving this house and going to some other. The reason given

<sup>1</sup> Instead of a generic term corresponding to the English "money" (E. V.) Luke has "silver" (ἀργύριον), Mark "copper" or "bronze" or "brass" (χαλκός is thus variously translated), while Matthew has both. The "wallet" (πήρα, A. V. "scrip") was a bag used chiefly for carrying provisions. Money was usually carried in the belt (ζώνη, Matt. and Mark); but Luke in x., 4, has a special term (βαλλάντιον) for "purse." On "coats," see p. 110, Note<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. John xx., 19, 21, 26.

for accepting the continuous hospitality of a single household, *for the labourer is worthy of his hire*, is not suggested by either Matthew or Mark. The disciples were not to feel that they were a burden to those who entertained them, since their teaching and healing would be a full equivalent for what they received. Where they were not kindly welcomed they were to turn away, shaking off the very dust from their feet as a sign of complete separation. The message which, according to Luke x., 9, they were sent out to deliver, *The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you*, they were to repeat as a final warning to those who would not receive them. *Howbeit, etc.* (verse 11), that is, "Even though you do reject our message, it is true nevertheless that the kingdom of heaven, with its day of judgment, is at hand." Unbelief will be a sign of such hardness of heart as was not shown even by the inhabitants of the cities of the plain, who were summarily destroyed for their wickedness.<sup>1</sup> Finally, considering the dangers which would constantly threaten his messengers, Jesus cautions them to exercise great prudence and self-restraint.

## NOTE.

(a, p. 181) Not only are Matthew and Mark silent with regard to such a second mission, but additional doubt is thrown upon its reality by the larger number said to have been sent,—many more than the narrow region traversed would seem to demand, and more than the little band of disciples could furnish of competent men,—by the absence of any mention of the particulars of their journeyings, and by their speedy and unaccountable return. These difficulties have led to the conjecture that the narrative is an allegory descriptive of the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles, the seventy missionaries representing the supposed seventy nations of the world\* ; but the existence of Luke's narrative

<sup>1</sup> See Gen. xiii., 13, xviii., 20, xix., 24.

\* The record does not make it apparent that the seventy were sent out on an exclusively Gentile mission,

is explicable on the simple supposition of a confusion of numbers leading to the unconscious duplication of the Synoptic account.

### § 89. JUDGMENT UPON THE CITIES OF GALILEE.

*Matt. xi., 20-24 ; Luke x., 13-16.*

Jesus is not here imprecating the divine vengeance upon the unrepentant lake towns, but only reproaching them for their unbelief.<sup>1</sup> The seacoast cities of Tyre and Sidon were in specially ill repute among the Jews ; yet Jesus declares that in these heathen towns the truth of the gospel would receive a heartier welcome than was given to it in his native Galilee. To sit clothed only in hair-cloth<sup>2</sup> and with ashes upon the head was a sign of mortification and sorrow.<sup>3</sup> When it is said that Capernaum, instead of being exalted to heaven, "will be cast down even to Hades," the utter ruin of the city is predicted (*a*).

#### NOTE.

(*a*, p. 184) Hades, a comparatively rare word in the New Testament, is often met with in classical Greek, where it is used to designate both the king of the underworld and the realm over which he presides. In the LXX. it represents the Hebrew *sheol*, but with this difference, that there is more activity in the Greek than in the Hebrew underworld. Since Hades included both Elysium, the abode of the blest, and Tartarus, the place of punishment of the wicked, it cannot properly be translated, as in the Authorised Version, by the English word "hell." \*

<sup>1</sup> See § 35, p. 99, and Note (*e*), p. 101.

<sup>2</sup> Also called "sackcloth," because it was the material from which sacks were commonly made. Cp. Rev. vi., 12: "sackcloth of hair." Prophets dressed in sackcloth: see Rev. xi., 3. These four are the only N. T. instances of the word.

<sup>3</sup> See § 46, Note <sup>1</sup>, p. 121.

\* In Rev. xx., 13, 14, "death" and "Hades" are coupled together.

### § 90. PROSPECTIVE SUFFERINGS OF THE DISCIPLES.

*Matt. x., 17-25 ; Luke xii., 11-12.*

The caution of Jesus to the twelve, that they should be on their guard lest they should get into trouble in the course of their journeyings, sprang from his conviction that they would not be allowed to carry on their mission without interference but would be likely to be arrested as disturbers of the public peace. They would be brought before the local councils, which, in the country towns, exercised many of the functions of the national sanhedrin, and would run the risk of being flogged in the synagogues, whose officers had jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical. They might even be summoned to appear before the Roman governor on the charge of disloyalty to the Empire, because of their announcing the speedy setting up of a new kingdom ; or the Herods, anxious for the safety of their dynasty, might call the Galilean haranguers of the people to account.<sup>1</sup> *For my sake* = on my account, because you are my disciples (*a*).

When the missionaries should be called upon to make their defence, they were not, after the usual manner of pleading before judges, to think beforehand<sup>2</sup> what it was best for them to say. Instead of employing the art of the rhetorician, in which they had no skill, they were to trust to the indwelling power of the Spirit of God,<sup>3</sup> through which fitting words would be brought to their tongues. The rest of the section, in which Matthew stands alone, can be fully understood only in the light of the later discourses of Jesus. Following predictions of persecution are encouragements to

<sup>1</sup> The Galileans were always a turbulent folk, who gave their rulers no end of trouble.

<sup>2</sup> This is the exact meaning of *μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε* in Mark xiii., 11. See § 51 (*a*).

<sup>3</sup> Only here in the N. T. do we meet with Matthew's phrase, *the spirit of your Father*.

patience in the midst of trials, strengthened by the assurance of final deliverance. The salvation spoken of is something to be realised in the not distant future and is connected with the coming of the Son of Man—an event which is to take place before the twelve shall have had time to preach the gospel in all the cities of Israel. This may be considered the beginning of the eschatological utterances of Jesus. In the last two verses the disciples are warned not to expect any more friendly reception than has been given to their master, for they are likely to be treated with even less consideration. It is not said in the Gospels that anyone had actually called Jesus Beelzebub ; but it was substantially the same thing to say that he cast out demons through power derived from the prince of the demons.<sup>1</sup>

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 185) This first paragraph of Matthew is strikingly like Mark xiii., 9, where the passage has a much more suitable connection. So verses 19 and 20, with their parallels in Luke, appear to rest upon Mark xiii., 11. It is incredible that almost at the very beginning of his ministry, before he had made trial of the temper of his countrymen and their rulers, Jesus should have anticipated such hostile treatment on their part as to call for this prophecy of evil. Even the last verse of § 89, which is somewhat better placed in Luke as a part of the later charge to the seventy, must share in the suspicion which attaches to the chronology of the greater part of § 90. At the time when the Gospels were composed, actual experience of violent persecution might well have dictated such language and put it prophetically into the mouth of the Master.

## § 91. ENCOURAGEMENT TO BOLDNESS.

*Matt. x., 26-33 ; Luke xii., 2-9.*

Notwithstanding the generally close resemblance in language between Matthew and Luke in this section, the context

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xii., 24. On "Beelzebub" see § 65, Note \*.

in the two Gospels is altogether different, Luke assigning these sentences to the comparatively late discourse from which his contribution to the preceding section was taken, while Matthew introduces them as a continuation of the instructions to the twelve. In both cases, however, the essential thoughts are the same. To the twelve he declares that a timid and hesitating proclamation of the truth will not insure their safety ; therefore they are to speak out boldly, fearing nothing. In Luke, instead of an injunction to declare the truth, there is the simple statement that whatever the disciples teach will become known everywhere. In both cases alike it is enjoined upon them not to be afraid of those who merely threaten the life of the body, but to stand in awe only of Him whose power over both body and soul is absolute, that is, God.<sup>1</sup> The only thing to be afraid of either in this world or the next is the consequences of our own evil-doing. Jesus assures those whom he is sending out into the midst of dangers that they can nowhere be beyond the Father's care, whatever may befall them, for that He who observes even the fall of the sparrow<sup>2</sup> cannot be unmindful of the fate of those who go forth as messengers of the truth. There is here no assurance that the disciples will not suffer, nor even that they will be delivered from their sufferings, but only that their self-sacrifice will not be unobserved by Him who watches over all. As not one sparrow in its death *is forgotten in the sight of God*, so they will be

<sup>1</sup> Some scholars have thought that the reference is to Satan ; but nowhere in the Bible, either in the O. T. or the N. T., is the great Adversary represented as having any such power over the destinies of men as is here spoken of. On "Gehenna" (marginal reading for "hell") see § 38 (a).

<sup>2</sup> Small birds of various kinds, but especially those of the sparrow family, were called by the Greeks *στρουθία* (*strouthia*). "Farthing" is only an approximate rendering of *ἀσάριον* = Latin *assarium*, dimin. of *as*.



remembered by Him, whatever befalls them. Their reward for risking and perhaps losing their lives will be the Divine approval.<sup>1</sup> Since, soon after the sending out of the twelve and before the commissioning of the seventy Jesus had foreseen his own fate,<sup>2</sup> the impending martyrdom of some of his disciples is likely to have been equally anticipated by him. The following statement, that even the hairs of their head are all numbered, is a renewed assertion of the completeness of God's knowledge of the condition of His children. Not the slightest thing could happen to them without His knowing it. This is not such an assurance of preservation from danger as elsewhere in the Scriptures is couched in somewhat similar language.<sup>3</sup> Finally, the results both of faithfulness and of unfaithfulness in preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom are set forth. Those who boldly deliver their message regardless of consequences their master will recognise as faithful disciples; those who from considerations of personal safety act the part of cowards he will not own.

## § 92. CONSEQUENCES OF GOSPEL PREACHING.

*Matt. x., 34-36; Luke xii., 51-53.*

Not purpose but result is expressed by the infinitives. Luke abandons this idiom after the first sentence. It was the expectation of the Jews that the Messianic reign would be one of profound peace<sup>4</sup>: Jesus declares that in its inauguration it will be rather a period of conflict. Even family ties will be ruptured through the inability of members of the

<sup>1</sup> Cp. *Matt. x., 39, xvi., 25; Mark viii., 35; Luke ix., 24, xvii., 33; John xii., 25.*

<sup>2</sup> See *Luke ix., 44.*

<sup>3</sup> See *Luke xxi., 18; Acts xxvii., 34; 1 Sam. xiv., 45; 2 Sam. xiv., 11; 1 Kings i., 52.*

<sup>4</sup> See *Is. ii., 4, xi., 6-9; Mic. iv., 3.*

same household to look upon his mission in the same light. The language of the section seems to be borrowed in part from Micah vii., 6, although there instead of being predictive it is descriptive of the condition of things in the time of the prophet.<sup>1</sup>

### § 93. CONDITIONS OF DISCIPLESHIP

*Matt. x., 37-39; Luke xiv., 25-33.*

The fear of such consequences as have just been described will not deter the true disciple from remaining faithful to his master. There is nothing which he will not sacrifice, not even life itself, for the sake of the truth. Family and friends must not be allowed to dominate one's convictions, and every other obligation must be held subordinate to the claims of spiritual kinship.<sup>2</sup> In Luke these words are addressed to a multitude of people who, so far as appears, are not already disciples. To give the utmost possible emphasis to his words, Jesus uses a striking figure of speech, declaring that he who would be a true disciple of his must be ready to take up his cross and follow him. Those who were sentenced to crucifixion were compelled to carry their cross, a painful burden, to the place of execution : so the follower of Jesus must be ready to suffer everything in his cause. That under these conditions it is wise for those who would be his followers to

<sup>1</sup> There are closer parallels to the sense in the Talmuds. Rabbi Neborai is reported to have said : "In that generation in which the Son of David is about to come the young will bring shame to the faces of the old and the old will withstand the young : daughter will rise up against mother and daughter-in-law against mother-in-law, and the face of that generation will be as the face of dogs, and the son will not revere the parent." These things, however, are spoken of merely as signs of the times and as antecedent to rather than resulting from the advent of the Messiah.

<sup>2</sup> To "hate," in Luke, is only, in accordance with Hebrew usage, a strong synonyme for "love less,"

count the cost before committing themselves to his service is exemplified in Luke by the two parables of the Builder of the Tower and the King going to War. The paradox in Matthew's 39th verse<sup>1</sup> rests upon the double meaning of the word translated "life"<sup>2</sup>; for although the word "soul"<sup>3</sup> cannot be here introduced, "life" must be understood now in a physical and now in a spiritual sense. The condition of securing the higher life is the readiness to sacrifice, if necessary, the life of the body.

#### § 94. CONCLUSION OF THE MISSIONARY ADDRESS TO THE TWELVE.

*Matt. x., 40-42.*

From speaking of the duty of the disciples Jesus passes to a commendation of whoever shall give them a friendly reception. By declaring that to receive his messengers will be to receive him and so the One who sent him<sup>4</sup> he strives to strengthen still further the twelve for their mission. He wishes them to feel that it is God's work which they will be doing. To receive a prophet *in the name of a prophet* is to recognise his prophetic function, to welcome him because he is a messenger of truth and to revere him as a "man of God." So to receive a righteous man *in the name of a righteous man* is to treat him with the respect due to his uprightness of character. Again, *in the name of a disciple* is the same as "because he is my disciple."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Repeated in xvi., 25. Cp. Mark viii., 35; Luke ix., 24.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 17, Note <sup>1</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Margin of R. V.

<sup>4</sup> The same verb (*ἀποστέλλω*) is here used to indicate that Jesus was "sent forth" to his work which Mark employed (vi., 7) to describe the sending out of the twelve. Cp. Mark ix., 37.

<sup>5</sup> The nature of the reward to be received is not mentioned, but it may be conceived to be the same as that spoken of in Matt. v., 12. Cp. Mark ix., 41.

## § 95. SUMMARY OF MISSIONARY OPERATIONS.

*Matt. xi., 1; Mark vi., 12, 13; Luke ix., 6.*

Mark and Luke at the close of the brief paragraph in which each gives an account of the sending out of the twelve report the results of their mission. Matthew, on the other hand, speaks only of what Jesus himself did while the disciples were away. As they had been directed,<sup>1</sup> the twelve missionaries, after the example of Jesus himself,<sup>2</sup> did two things—they preached the “good news” and healed the sick. Mark makes their message to have been precisely that of Jesus and John<sup>3</sup>—*that men should repent*. Luke speaks only in general terms of their healing, while Mark, in addition to cures of demoniacism, mentions those which were wrought upon many of the infirm<sup>4</sup> by one of the means in common use among the physicians of that day—anointing with oil.<sup>5</sup> Matthew, in describing the work of Jesus at this time, seems to make a distinction between teaching and preaching, perhaps intending by the latter term to denote the proclamation of the advent of the Kingdom, and by the former whatever of a more general character entered into his discourses.

## § 96. HEROD'S CURIOSITY CONCERNING JESUS.

*Matt. xiv., 1, 2; Mark vi., 14-16; Luke ix., 7-9.*

Mark speaks of Herod Antipas as “king,” but the others give him his proper title of “tetrarch.”<sup>6</sup> The occasion,

<sup>1</sup> Luke ix., 1, 2 (Mark vi., 7).

<sup>2</sup> Matt. iv., 23.

<sup>3</sup> Matt. iii., 2, iv., 17.

<sup>4</sup> ἀρρώστους (*arrōstōus*), “without strength.”

<sup>5</sup> A practice once more mentioned in the N. T. (James v., 14) and enjoined to be used in connection with prayer.

<sup>6</sup> See p. 46, Note .<sup>1</sup>

according to Matthew, was Herod's hearing the current rumours concerning Jesus ; from the preceding context in Mark and Luke it is to be inferred that it was what the twelve were doing which attracted his attention and excited his curiosity with regard to their master. If we are to choose between the assertion of Matthew and Mark, that Herod declared that Jesus was John the Baptist risen from the dead, and Luke's statement, that this *was said by some*, the preference is to be given to the latter, who seems to make the tetrarch reject the suggestion of the populace, that John is still alive, on the very ground that he himself had put him to death and that therefore this Galilean agitator must be someone else. The reports concerning Jesus seem to make him, except in his wonder-working, a second John the Baptist. The superstitious multitude accounted for the reported marvels on the ground that one who had himself burst the bars of death might be supposed to have control over the "powers" of nature. Rumours are said to have varied, some thinking of Jesus rather as Elijah, whose return to earth was expected,<sup>1</sup> or as some other of the old prophets. According to Mark some only thought of him as a prophet resembling those of old.

#### § 97. EPISODE OF THE IMPRISONMENT AND EXECUTION OF THE BAPTIST.

*Matt. xiv., 3-12 ; Mark vi., 17-29 ; Luke iii., 19, 20.*

The mention of the beheading of John leads Mark to give a full account of the circumstances under which it happened. Matthew does the same thing more briefly, while Luke in another connection merely mentions the fact of the imprisonment and nowhere enters into particulars concerning it (*a*). The three Synoptics agree in assigning as the cause of the imprisonment of John his rebuke of Herod for his unlawful

<sup>1</sup> See § 7 (*c*), p. 27.

union with Herodias, the wife of his half-brother Philip.<sup>1</sup> Herod's lawful wife, whom, having become enamoured of Herodias, he had repudiated, was Mariamne, daughter of the Arabian king, Aretas.<sup>2</sup> Josephus<sup>3</sup> gives as the reason for the murder of John the fear which the monarch had lest his harangues to the people should stir up sedition. Luke refers indefinitely to other of Herod's offences besides his marriage to Herodias as having been condemned by the Baptist. Since most self-willed people of an impetuous temper often act under the influence of conflicting emotions, the course of Herod is likely to have been prompted by mixed motives with which all the narrators were imperfectly acquainted (*b*).

Mark represents Herodias as waiting for a convenient opportunity for working the ruin of the Baptist—an opportunity which the birthday<sup>4</sup> festival of the monarch afforded. When he had invited his courtiers<sup>5</sup> and the Roman military officers of high rank<sup>6</sup> and the leading men of Galilee to the banquet, Salome,<sup>7</sup> the daughter of Herodias, danced for their entertainment. The mere fact of the general laxity of morals among the professional dancers of that day furnishes no sufficient reason for assuming that there was anything

<sup>1</sup> Mark mentions the brother's name, which Luke does not give. In Matthew the reading *Φιλίππου* (*Philippou*) is of doubtful genuineness. This Philip is not the tetrarch mentioned in Luke iii., 1. See Appendix C.

<sup>2</sup> See Josephus, *Ant.*, xviii., 5, 4.

<sup>3</sup> *Ant.*, xviii., 5, 2.

<sup>4</sup> A word is here used (*γενέσια*) which in earlier times had been applied only to memorial celebrations of birthdays of the dead.

<sup>5</sup> E. V. "lords." Etymologically "maguates" would come nearer to the Greek.

<sup>6</sup> "High captains" (E. V.) should give place to the more exact "chiliarchs" (this technical term having now won for itself a place in our language), unless we are prepared to use its almost exact modern equivalent, "colonels."

<sup>7</sup> We learn her name from Josephus, *Ant.*, xviii., 5, 4.

immodest in her behaviour.<sup>1</sup> When Salome, having been solemnly promised by Herod anything which she may ask, requests that the head of John may be brought to her upon a trencher,<sup>2</sup> the king yields unwillingly to her demand and dispatches one of his body-guard<sup>3</sup> to act as executioner (*c*). From the form of the statement it would seem that Herod had two distinct reasons for granting Salome's request, but the two are really one—the fear lest in the eyes of his guests he should appear as one who had violated his oath.

## NOTES.

(*a*, p. 192) Mark's superiority over the other Synoptics as a narrator of facts is here well illustrated. This is one of the few instances in which Matthew appears to have abbreviated the account of Mark, unless indeed he was immediately indebted to some other source (a proto-Mark ?) rather than to our canonical Second Gospel,—which latter supposition will account for certain discrepancies in the two narratives. (See below.)

(*b*, p. 193) Matthew and Mark do not agree in their representations of the real feeling of Herod toward John. The former gives the impression that the tetrarch desired his death and was only restrained from gratifying this desire without delay by his fear lest such an act of violence should alienate the people ; the latter declares that Herod, because of his respect for the character of John, protected him from

<sup>1</sup> "Her dancing was doubtless of a mimetic and wanton character." —Meyer. So, by distinct implication, both Gould and Swete.

<sup>2</sup> "*Charger*" being nearly if not quite obsolete in the sense in which the E. V. uses it, the Revisers should have substituted for it some better word. There is no lack of suitable terms with a sufficiently ancient flavour, since Wiclif's Bible has "platter" repeatedly, and Chaucer speaks of "plates." In fact both the A. V. and the R. V. have the word "platter" in the only other N. T. passage in which *πίναξ* (*pinax*) occurs, Luke xi., 39.

<sup>3</sup> The Greek word, which occurs nowhere else, is a transliteration of the Latin *speculator*, substantially equivalent to "scout" or "spy." The term was commonly used to designate soldiers detailed for special duty, particularly as executioners.

the violence of Herodias, who desired that he should be put to death. Upon this point Luke has nothing to say.

(c, p. 194) Even Matthew represents him as regretting the necessity for complying with her request. If the evangelist is consistent with himself, Herod's regret must have been conceived by him as due solely to his anxiety with regard to the effect of his act upon the people ; but there may be in the account as it now stands a blending of two different conceptions of the temper of the king.

## § 98. RETURN OF THE MISSIONARIES.

*Mark vi., 30 ; Luke ix., 10a, x., 17-20.*

While both Mark and Luke barely mention in the most general terms the result of the mission of the twelve, the latter tells of the way in which Jesus received the brief yet specific report of the larger band. The seventy appear to have been especially elated at their success in casting out demons, as though they had hardly expected that this would be one of the things which they could do. That they performed these cures in his *name* suggests some mention of him in their exorcisms<sup>1</sup> in a way to affect the diseased imaginations of the demoniacs, who knew of his reputed skill in the treatment of cases like theirs. When Jesus in his reply to the seventy says that he saw Satan like lightning fall from heaven,<sup>2</sup> he must be understood as referring to his confident expectation at the time of sending them out that they would be successful in their mission, the general purpose of which was the overthrow of evil in all its forms. In imagination he had seen this already accomplished. Using several figurative terms to describe the untoward influences which surround them, he assures them that none of the powers of evil can really do them harm. In the last verse the first injunction is not absolute but relative. The

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Acts xix., 13, 15.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Lam. ii., 1.



disciples are to rejoice not so much that they are able to cast out demons as that their *names are written in heaven*.<sup>1</sup> The thought is of citizenship in the heavenly kingdom.<sup>2</sup>

§ 99. AN UTTERANCE OF THANKFULNESS,  
WITH ADDED WORDS TO THE DISCIPLES.

*Matt. xii., 25-27 ; Luke x., 21, 22.*

Whether or not the last verse should be introduced, as in some MSS. and editions, by the direct statement that the words were spoken to the disciples,<sup>3</sup> the section is easily divisible into two unlike portions, the former of which is distinctly a monologue, while the latter naturally implies the presence of auditors. It is the inference of Luke from the words spoken that Jesus was at this time in a state of unusual spiritual exaltation. The last verse forcibly reminds us of some of the utterances ascribed to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel.<sup>4</sup> Matthew only represents Jesus as beginning a new utterance,—for that is all that is implied in the phrase *answered and said*.<sup>5</sup> The things which had been concealed from the wise men of the world and revealed to those who were but babes<sup>6</sup> in intelligence were “the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven”<sup>7</sup> which the disciples had been commissioned to make known to the common people, to whose

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Dan. xii., 1 ; Heb. xii., 23 ; Rev. xvii., 8, xx., 12, 15, xxi., 27.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Phil. iii., 20.

<sup>3</sup> “And turning to the disciples he said” is the reading of Tisch. and the Tisch.-Gebh. text, to which Westcott and Hort add “privately.” Matthew introduces these verses in a much less suitable connection than Luke.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. especially John iii., 35, xvi., 15, xvii., 10.

<sup>5</sup> This is a common Hebrew idiom. See Robinson's *Gesenius' Heb. Lex.*, 799, second column, 2.

<sup>6</sup> *νηπιοι* (*nēpiōi*), etymologically, “without power of speech.”

<sup>7</sup> Matt. xiii., 11 (§ 71).

ranks they themselves belonged. The success of his humble followers caused Jesus to be thankful that Providence had assigned him these unlettered folk as helpers, rather than men of lofty station trained in the schools and proud of their attainments. The following confirmatory clause, *for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight*, is equivalent to "for this was thy will." In the first clause of the last verse it is implied that there are no limits to the application of the principles taught by Jesus, but that all men under all circumstances are subject to the will of God as revealed through him. What follows is a claim on the part of Jesus to a unique knowledge of the will of God<sup>1</sup> and to such intimate communion with the Father that he was known to Him as to no human being. He does not, however, claim for himself alone this divine fellowship, but declares that its realisation is possible to all who accept the truth which he reveals.<sup>2</sup>

### § 100. INVITATION TO THE WEARY.

*Matt. xi., 28-30.*

This passage could have come only from one familiar with the words of the ancient prophets. Not that there is here any direct borrowing, but the mind of Jesus was so steeped in the language of the noblest portions of the Old Testament Scriptures that even the most spontaneous utterances of his loftiest moments naturally clothed themselves in the prophetic garb.<sup>3</sup> He invites all "who are weary and burdened" to accept the

<sup>1</sup> The E. V. makes no distinction between *γινώσκει* in Luke and *ἐπιγινώσκει* in Matthew, the latter of which means "to know thoroughly" and not simply "to know."

<sup>2</sup> Cp. John xvii., 3: "This is the eternal life, that they may know thee, the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, Jesus Christ."

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Is. xiv., 3. xxviii., 12, lv., 1-3; Jer. vi., 16, xxxi., 2, 25; Ecclus. vi., 24, 25, 28. 29, li., 26.

<sup>4</sup> Better than *who labour and are heavy laden* of the E. V.

relief which he offers. The burdens which his countrymen bore were those placed upon them by the ceremonial and traditional law, the details of which were so numerous, and so completely covered all the relations of life, that even life itself had come to be almost a burden.<sup>1</sup> Employing the familiar figure of the "yoke" (used by metonymy for the load which rests upon it)<sup>2</sup> he declares that his yoke does not bear heavily upon the necks of his disciples but is so exactly adapted to their strength that they bear it willingly and even joyfully.<sup>3</sup>

### § 101. THE FEEDING OF FIVE THOUSAND.

*Matt. xiv., 13-21; Mark vi., 31-34, Luke ix., 10b-17.*

Matthew represents the withdrawal of Jesus from the scene of his previous activity as having been the result of the announcement of the murder of the Baptist; but the other evangelists (including the Fourth, who here has an account<sup>4</sup> parallel to that of the Synoptics) do not in any way connect these two events. According to Mark the return of the twelve from their first mission was what led Jesus to make an effort to separate himself for a time from the multitude, with a view to uninterrupted converse with his disciples. Luke, though making no explicit declaration upon this point, seems to be in harmony with Mark. The Fourth Gospel gives no reason whatever for this movement on the part of Jesus, which it assigns to a time subsequent to some visit to Jerusalem not spoken of by the Synoptists; but it incidentally adds confirmation to Matthew's statement, since it takes Jesus across the Sea of Galilee into the dominion of Philip and so out of the jurisdiction of Herod Antipas. Although in search of retirement, the strong human sympathy of Jesus will not allow

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Acts xv., 10; Gal. v., 1; Matt. xxiii., 4; Luke xi., 46.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Jer. v., 5.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. 1 John v., 3.

<sup>4</sup> John vi., 1-13.

him to hold himself apart from those who have followed him on foot around the head of the lake while he has been crossing in the boat.<sup>1</sup> Matthew and Mark speak of a crowd gathered soon after his landing ; John takes him up " into the mountain,"<sup>2</sup> where the multitude find him. Those who were sick he healed, and to all he spoke of *the kingdom of God* (Luke) and taught them *many things* (Mark). Toward the close of the day (so all but John, who says nothing about the hour), when the time for the evening meal draws near, in some wonderful way the small stock of provisions which the disciples report as at hand is made to serve all the needs of the immense multitude<sup>3</sup> (*a*). There can be no question that the evangelists intended to represent Jesus as multiplying the supposed scanty stock of food by superhuman power ; but all that is testified to as a fact of observation is that, although there appeared to be an altogether inadequate supply of provisions, somehow or other the appetites of all were satisfied and much was left over for another meal.<sup>4</sup> The conception of the evangelists is the, to us, unthinkable and therefore incredible one of a creation of something out of nothing. We may either rest in the simple conviction that nothing which happened can have been at variance with the laws either of matter or of mind, or we may seek to utilise these laws for the explanation of the phenomena by framing

<sup>1</sup> Only Matthew and Mark speak clearly of his crossing the lake. Luke brings him to Bethsaida, which may have been either Bethsaida in Galilee or the (supposed) Bethsaida Julias on the other side of the Jordan. (See § 102 (*a*).) John says simply that " he went away to the other side of the sea of Galilee."

<sup>2</sup> A "mountain" in the N. T. seems to be almost any considerable elevation.

<sup>3</sup> *Five thousand* could, of course, be only a rough guess.

<sup>4</sup> Mark vi., 51, 52, gives a hint that, so far from those present at the time observing anything strange, the twelve were quite astonished when a little later Jesus showed the possession of a wonderful power over nature, as though they had witnessed nothing of the sort before.

some hypothesis which shall make the circumstances described by the Synoptists more intelligible (*b*).

#### NOTES.

(*a*, p. 199) John's account here differs from that of the Synoptists chiefly in representing Jesus as purposing in advance a manifestation of his power, while they leave it to be inferred from the result that something wonderful was done by him. In the Synoptic narrative Jesus only comes to the aid of the disciples when they find themselves confronted with a serious difficulty ; John makes him seek in a roundabout way an opportunity for doing what he has already determined upon. We have in substance a single report presented in two slightly differing forms. The particulars in which the late Fourth Gospel does not agree with the others show the influence either of a shifting tradition or of the dogmatic tendency under the influence of which the author acknowledges that he is writing. It is not to be overlooked, that of all the marvels described by all three of the Synoptists this is the only one found in the Fourth Gospel. In its character it is especially suited to John's purpose, which is to show that Jesus was in some exceptional sense the Son of God \* ; for this is one of the very few wonderful works ascribed to Jesus in which there is a manifestation of power unexampled in the history of the human race. John having in the prologue of his Gospel represented Jesus as the embodiment of the divine creative Word, the story of the wonderful increase of the loaves and fishes, separated as it is in the narrative from the kindred wonder of turning water into wine (not found in the Synoptics) by but a single unimportant instance of healing, would naturally have its dogmatic significance made prominent in the telling of the story. The simple unadorned narrative of the Synoptists therefore furnishes the only satisfactory basis for a critical investigation into the historical value of the account.

(*b*, p. 200) The leading hypotheses which have been suggested are these : (1) That there were others besides the lad mentioned in the Fourth Gospel who had food with them, although at the time when the disciples spoke to Jesus they were not aware of the fact, which was known to him ; that, follow-

\* John xx., 31.

ing the example of the twelve, the rest of the company contributed what they had brought with them to the common stock, which proved to be a supply sufficient for all. This conjecture rests upon the antecedent improbability that so many persons, coming mostly from a great distance, should have been so completely without forethought as to make no provision for supplying their physical wants. (2) That the story originated in a pure myth intended to represent Jesus as feeding his followers with the bread of life, there having been no historical circumstances like those described. (3) There are several hypotheses which combine historical and legendary elements in various ways. One of the latest of these is that suggested by Réville,\* that Jesus, upon occasion of a love-feast with his disciples, speaking after his usual manner, represented the kingdom of heaven under the figure of a few loaves of bread adequate to supplying the wants of a great multitude,—words which later were misunderstood and made to describe a supposed historical event.

## § 102. THE WALKING UPON THE SEA.

*Matt. xiv., 22-36; Mark vi., 45-56.*

The contents of this section are closely connected with those of the preceding one, John still running parallel with the Synoptics. Matthew's narrative is here the fullest of all, he having introduced an important incident not mentioned by the others. All agree that Jesus sent the twelve home in the boat from the place where the multitudes had been fed and that he met them near their destination, walking upon the stormy sea, which, on his entering the boat, became calm.<sup>1</sup> Matthew represents Peter as leaving the boat and walking upon the water to meet Jesus, although at last he is frightened by the wind and needs the hand of Jesus to stay him. There is no uncertainty as to the intent of the evangelists in their record again to portray Jesus as exercising his wonder-working power in the control of the forces of

\* ii., 71, 73.

<sup>1</sup> John does not mention this last circumstance.

nature.<sup>1</sup> One geographical problem presents itself which this section has in common with the preceding, and the solution of which is necessary to a clear understanding of the situation both here and there, namely, whether the evangelists speak of two Bethsaidas or of only one (*a*). Criticism also has to consider the question of the historicity of the account (*b*). Whether it was the intention upon setting out to go to Capernaum (John) or only to Bethsaida (Mark), the actual landing-place was farther south than either, in the plain of Gennesaret. Here previous experiences were repeated, infirm people in great numbers being brought to Jesus for help, with the result that mere contact with his garments was effective in the working of cures. Cp. § 85.

## NOTES.

(*a*, p. 202) Matthew's single mention of the place (xi., 21) gives no direct information as to its situation, but the preceding context plainly locates it in Galilee. Mark vi., 45, places it across the lake from the place of the feeding of the multitudes on the occasion of which an account is given in the preceding section; from viii., 22, no information is derived. Luke ix., 10, taken in connection with the preceding context (viii., 37, 40, ix., 7-9), appears to place the town on the western shore of the lake, not very far from Capernaum, while x., 13, is only parallel with Matt. xi., 21. John xii., 21 (cp. i., 44\*) explicitly locates Bethsaida in Galilee. These are the only places in the New Testament where the town is mentioned. Josephus† locates it vaguely upon Lake Gennesaret. As a solution of the supposed geographical difficulties of the present narrative it has been imagined and is even now quite generally assumed that there was a second Bethsaida east of the Jordan, the one referred to by Josephus. Another suggestion is that there was but one Bethsaida, situated at the mouth of the Jordan but on both sides of the river, which would make the western part "Bethsaida of Galilee" and the eastern "Bethsaida Julias."

Matthew and Mark agree in saying that Jesus and his

<sup>1</sup> Matthew's 33d verse makes this plain.

\* Tisch., i., 45. † *Ant.*, xviii., 2, 1.

disciples crossed some part of the lake in going to the place, where they were disappointed in their hope of being by themselves. Luke makes this place to have been in the vicinity of Bethsaida, while Mark says that they afterwards set out in their boat to go to Bethsaida, and John speaks of their embarking for Capernaum and arriving there. It is Luke's statement which seems to introduce confusion into the narrative. Leaving out of the account for the moment his testimony upon this particular point, it would appear from the concurrent statements of the other evangelists that Jesus and his disciples started in their boat from some point upon the north-western shore of the lake and landed at a secluded spot three or four miles distant. From this place the others returned several hours later by boat, while Jesus walked along the shore toward Capernaum. Now since Luke plainly intimates that the feeding of the multitudes did not take place in Bethsaida itself but in some solitary place away from this and other towns, there is in his account ample room for the insertion of the transportation of the little company by boat to a desirable spot on the lakeside where there was no village—a circumstance which, if he was acquainted with it, may have seemed to him too unimportant to mention.

(*b*, p. 202) Of the two supra-natural elements of the story one has already been met with in § 83. In the other is involved an unexampled overcoming of the power of gravitation. For the time being the bodies both of Jesus and of Peter are virtually without specific gravity, although the cowardice of the latter soon brings him back to his normal condition. The difficulties of the account have been sought to be removed by various hypotheses, of which two typical ones may be mentioned. (1) It has been suggested that by *on the sea* is meant "along the shore of the sea"; but this supposition, even if allowable, gives no real relief, since Matthew unequivocally speaks of Peter walking *upon the waters*. Taking note of Matthew's account it is therefore necessary to go outside of the narrative to find an explanation. (2) The whole account taken together has been looked upon as only another instance of the conversion of myth into ostensible history. In one of its most recent forms this interpretation makes the story to have been originally a vivid presentation of the moral grandeur of Jesus and his ability to overcome even the greatest obstacles.



The following explanation is based upon historical elements furnished by the evangelists themselves, who are assumed to be attempting a record of facts of which they had a more or less exact knowledge. Since the Lake of Gennesaret is nearly seven miles wide and John (vi., 19) makes the passage home to have been only about half this distance, his "went away to the other side of the sea" (vi., 1) and "were going over the sea unto Capernaum" (vi., 17) as well as the "crossed over" of Matthew and Mark can be understood only of traversing some small portion of the lake. In the Synoptics there is no hint of a *crossing* of the lake when Jesus and his companions left home in the earlier part of the day. There is no difficulty then in understanding that the disciples in the boat, although they supposed themselves to be some distance from land, had been constantly driven by the contrary wind (Matthew and Mark) toward the shore, which, in the darkness (John) they imagined to be still distant. The Fourth Gospel, indeed, artlessly testifies to this when it says that, after taking in Jesus, "straightway the boat was at the land whither they were going,"—although this speedy arrival may have seemed to the narrator a part of the marvel. If Jesus, arriving at the landing-place just as the boat was approaching the shore, had observed the anxiety of the disciples and gone to their aid, his passing through the shallow water might have appeared, in the obscurity of the night, like a walking upon the sea, as later tradition represented it to have been. Whatever the facts, the disciples would be in no fit condition to observe and report them accurately.

### § 103. OF HAND-WASHING.

*Matt. xv., 1-20; Mark vii., 1-23.*

The accounts of Matthew and Mark here run substantially parallel, although each has something which the other has not. For the information of Gentile readers Mark adds to his fuller mention of the circumstances which led to the discussion of hand-washing a statement of Jewish usage in this respect.<sup>1</sup> The reference is not to the use of water for the

<sup>1</sup> This breaks up the grammatical connection and produces an anacoluthon which the R. V. avoids.

sake of securing personal cleanliness, except as this purification carried with it that removal of ceremonial defilement which was necessary to the lawful maintenance of fellowship in religious worship. Whatever in the eye of the law caused disqualification for such communion was called "common,"<sup>1</sup> which in this connection, where the word is applied to bodily impurity, Mark interprets to mean "unwashed." The ceremonial ablutions here spoken of, although specially characteristic of the Pharisees, are said by Mark to have been diligently<sup>2</sup> practised by all the Jews. Only once in the New Testament outside of this section<sup>3</sup> is the word here translated "tradition" met with in the sense in which it is here used. The *tradition of the elders* is the oral law by which the teachings of the older Scripture were gradually supplemented and at length almost supplanted.<sup>4</sup> According to Matthew Jesus makes a bold and aggressive reply<sup>5</sup> to the inquiry of the scribes and Pharisees why his disciples do not observe the injunctions of the traditional law with regard to purification

<sup>1</sup> *κοινός* (*kōinōs*), found in the Gospels only in this passage of Mark. In Acts x., 14, 28, xi., 8, the word is associated with the explanatory *ἀκάθαρτος* (*akathartōs*) "unclean," in the double phrase "common or [once *and*] unclean." The R. V. translates *κοινός* "unclean" in Rom. xiv., 14, the only other place in the N. T. where it stands alone and refers to ceremonial defilement.

<sup>2</sup> The propriety of the marginal *up to the elbow*, meant to be a translation of the new reading *πυγμῇ* (strictly "with the closed hand"), is very doubtful. In the next verse, for *wash themselves*, substitute "bathe," and for *washings* "rinsing." The Bible Union version consistently uses "immerse themselves" and "immersions." A closer rendering than *pots* would be "pint-pots." All the things mentioned seem to be articles of table furniture, none of which a strict Jew would use without first rinsing. *Brazen vessels* were in early use among the Jews. See Lev. vi., 28.

<sup>3</sup> In Gal. i., 14, "the traditions of my fathers."

<sup>4</sup> See Appendix H.

<sup>5</sup> Mark, it is true, reports the same thing, but somewhat less picturesquely.

before eating. An imputation has really been cast upon him as their teacher, and he accepts the challenge to defend himself. Turning the tables upon them he demands to know why *they* cling to man-made traditions which are at variance with the law of God. About the value of tradition in general Jesus has nothing to say, but he does object to having tradition quoted against him by men who deal deceitfully with the plainest injunctions of the moral law. Such an offence they were guilty of when they placed the obligation to support the services of religion above the duty of providing for one's parents. He reads their condemnation in words which Isaiah had addressed to his contemporaries at a time when they were likewise given to depending more upon man than upon God.<sup>1</sup> It is this quotation which in Mark leads up to the declaration of Jesus, twice repeated, that the scribes and Pharisees place human above divine enactments, after which comes in the particular illustrative case which Matthew has mentioned earlier. Citing both the command of the Decalogue<sup>2</sup> with regard to the honouring of father and mother and the penalty imposed in the law<sup>3</sup> for its violation he exposes the guilt of those who assume to free men from this obligation by a device wearing the mask of piety. According to the teaching of some at least of the rabbis a man who announced that he had set apart his wealth for religious uses was thereby not only absolved from the obligation to

<sup>1</sup> Is. xxix., 13. The quotation follows substantially the version of the LXX., which in the last clause is not a very close rendering of the Hebrew. For the circumstances see Toy, 42-44.

<sup>2</sup> Ex. xx., 12. While Matthew ascribes the commandment directly to the Deity, Mark mentions Moses through whose instrumentality it was given, though afterwards (verse 13) referring to it directly as *the word of God*.

<sup>3</sup> Ex. xxi., 17. It is not to be inferred from his citing this law that Jesus would have had capital punishment inflicted upon those who dishonoured their parents: he only wishes to call attention to the heinousness of the offence in the eyes of the Jewish lawgiver.

support his parents, but was even forbidden to do so, whether he actually carried out the purpose already announced or not. What had once been thus consecrated, though only constructively, to the worship of Jehovah, could never become available for the particular purpose with regard to which it had been declared to be *corban*.<sup>1</sup> From his critics, whom he could only expect to silence, Jesus turns to the waiting people, whom he may hope to convince, and, calling them to him, he announces a new doctrine of purity. Notwithstanding the injunctions of the Mosaic law<sup>2</sup> with regard to the cleansing of vessels with which anything "unclean" has come in contact, he affirms the absolute worthlessness of all mere ceremonial ablutions. His teaching is that man is defiled and so rendered unworthy in the sight of God only by evil thoughts and not by taking this or that into his body.<sup>3</sup> The novelty of the idea and the conciseness with which it is at first expressed lead the disciples to speak of it as a "parable" and to ask for its explanation. Jesus, while expressing surprise at their stupidity, patiently elaborates for them what he had said to the multitude. Mark (verse 19) tersely sums up the whole by saying that the teaching of Jesus made all foods clean, that is, did away with the common distinction between things which might be eaten and those which might not. The Pharisees naturally were displeased that these things should be said to the people; but their reported displeasure only brought out from Jesus the proverbial remark that when a blind man leads a blind

<sup>1</sup> See Josephus, *Ant.*, iv., 4, 4; *Against Apion*, i., 1, 22. The Turks to-day are said to have the word *urban*, meaning "sacrifice."

<sup>2</sup> Lev. xi., 32.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Philo, *On the Creation of the World*, ch. xl.: "the mouth, through which, as Plato said, there is 'an entrance for mortal but an exit for imperishable things': for into it enter food and drink, perishable nutriment of a perishable body; but words come forth, immortal laws of an immortal soul, through which the rational life is governed."

man both must expect to fall into the ditch.<sup>1</sup> Their false doctrine, a plant not planted by the God of truth, will yet be rooted up. It is even intimated that the triumph of the truth will some day be universal.

### § 104. THE SYROPHŒNICIAN WOMAN.

*Matt. xv., 21-28; Mark vii., 24-30.*

From this time on we find Jesus, in company with his chosen disciples, in various places outside of Galilee. First he journeys northward to the narrow strip of non-Jewish country lying along the sea-coast, in which were the two famous cities of Tyre and Sidon.<sup>2</sup> Here he seeks in vain for retirement. A woman of the country<sup>3</sup> who has heard of his coming reports to him the case of her demoniac daughter and begs for relief. No symptoms except that of severe pain being mentioned by the evangelist, it is impossible to tell what was the condition of the sick girl. The disciples desire that Jesus shall grant the request of the woman as the quickest way of getting rid of her. He tells them that his mission is to *the lost sheep of<sup>4</sup> the house of Israel*, that is, to Jews and not to Gentiles,—a plain indication that he had not come into this region for the purpose of continuing the work which he had begun in Galilee. In addressing the woman he puts this thought into a different form. The Jews are no longer “lost sheep” but “children,” and the Gentiles are

<sup>1</sup> Luke has the proverb in a somewhat different form in vi., 39.

<sup>2</sup> It is from Mark alone that we learn a little later (verse 33) that he actually went through the latter city.

<sup>3</sup> Mark calls her a Syrophœnician Greek, but to the Jews “Greek” and “heathen” meant one and the same thing. Cp. Rom. ii., 9, 10, where the A. V. has “Gentile” instead of the “Greek” of the R. V.

<sup>4</sup> The “of” is not partitive, but is used to denote apposition.

likened to "little dogs" about the family table.<sup>1</sup> The children must be fed first.<sup>2</sup> She meets his further declaration that it is not fitting to throw down the children's food to the dogs by the shrewd remark that the dogs do get the crumbs which fall from the table. Her cleverness wins the day, and, encouraged by Jesus, she returns home to find the child free from her suffering. As described, the cure is magical.

### § 105. A JOURNEY TO THE DECAPOLIS.

*Matt. xv., 29-31; Mark vii., 31-37.*

The region known as the Decapolis lay south-east of the Sea of Galilee and received its name from the group of ten cities situated within its borders. The one cure of a stammering deaf man reported by Mark to have been performed there is expanded by Matthew into a series of cures of affections of the limbs and of the organs of speech and hearing. Some of the terms employed to describe these cases are used in a confused sense, but Mark's presentation of his single case is tolerably clear. The man who was cured was hard of hearing<sup>3</sup> and his speech was imperfect.<sup>4</sup> One receives from the story the impression that the loss of the power of accurate speech may have been closely related to the imperfection of the hearing, so often does extreme deafness

<sup>1</sup> We get a hint of the antiquity of the custom of allowing favourite dogs to be in attendance upon their master at meals in Homer, *Il.*, xxiii., 173, where nine are assigned to King Agamemnon.

<sup>2</sup> In Matthew's more Jewish Gospel there is no hint that the dogs (Gentiles) are ever to be fed. Cp. Rom. ii., 10.

<sup>3</sup> *κωφός* (*kōphōs*) does not carry with it the idea of complete deafness.

<sup>4</sup> *μογιλάλος* (*mōgilalōs*) = "speaking with difficulty." There is nothing in the word to indicate that the man had an organic *impediment in his speech*.

result in a deterioration of the voice ; and it is said that when the man was restored he spoke *plain*<sup>1</sup> (*a*).

NOTE.

(*a*, p. 210) The intent of the evangelist clearly is to describe an actual case of bodily cure ; but the story has not frequently been interpreted as a myth, the man's deafness being made typical of the unwillingness of so many of the Jews to accept the teachings of Jesus.

§ 106. THE FEEDING OF FOUR THOUSAND.

*Matt. xv., 32-39 ; Mark viii., 1-10.*

The main circumstances of this event are strikingly like those of § 101, and the points of difference few and unimportant. This second time the company is smaller but has been longer together. The loaves and fishes are somewhat more numerous than before but are still very few. It is the anxiety of Jesus that the wants of the people shall be provided for which furnishes the starting-point of the story. The fragments left over from the meal fill seven large baskets<sup>2</sup> instead of twelve small ones as on the former occasion (*a*).

NOTE.

(*a*, p. 210) It seems not unlikely that one and the same event has found its way into the Gospels in two different forms. That Jesus is said in *Matt. xvi., 9, 10*, and *Mark viii., 19, 20*, to have referred to two occasions does not settle the question ; for the evangelists, or those upon whom they depended, would naturally suppose that he must have mentioned both cases. Apart from the substantial identity of the two narratives (the chief difference being in the statement of

<sup>1</sup> The Greek is ὀρθῶς (*orthōs*), "straight."

<sup>2</sup> From *Acts. ix., 25*, it would appear that the capacity of this basket (*σπυρίς*) is quite likely to have been as much as a bushel, while the other (*κόφινος*) was only an individual luncheon-basket. No stress, however, is to be laid upon this use of different terms.

numbers, where confusion is always most likely to creep into an account), the fact that the disciples are as much astonished at the second prodigy as though they had had no previous experience of the sort tells strongly in favour of the hypothesis of a duplicate narrative.

§ 107. JESUS IS ASKED FOR A SIGN FROM  
HEAVEN.

*Matt. xvi., 1-4 ; Mark viii., 11-13 ; Luke xii., 54-56.*

The sign asked for by the Pharisees (Matthew says by the Sadducees also, who were seldom found coöperating with the rival sect) was something which should come direct from heaven and thus authenticate the claims of Jesus, what he had already said and done being to them not conclusive. Luke speaks vaguely of his addressing *the multitudes*, but it is only to scribes and Pharisees that the epithet "hypocrites" <sup>1</sup> (verse 56) is likely to have been applied. From their shrewdness in interpreting the signs of the weather it might be expected, so the words of Jesus imply, that they would have some skill in reading the signs of the times, to which he had in vain attempted to call their attention—signs which pointed to an impending crisis in the history of the nation. The representative character of those who had asked for a sign leads him to speak of the generation to which they belonged as *wicked and adulterous*—"adulterous" in the sense of being faithless to Jehovah.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Matt. xv., 7, xxii., 18, xxiii., 13, 14, 15 ; Mark vii., 6 ; Luke xii., 1.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Matt. xii., 39 ; Mark viii., 38 ; James iv., 4 ; Ezek. xvi., 15 ff., xxiii., 43 ff.



## § 108. OF THE LEAVEN OF THE PHARISEES.

*Matt. xvi., 5-12 ; Mark viii., 14-21 ; Luke xi., 53-xii., 1*

Matthew and Mark agree substantially as to the occasion when Jesus spoke to his disciples about the leaven of the Pharisees : it was either when they were crossing (Mark) or had crossed (Matthew) the lake from Dalmanutha to the eastern shore where Pharisees were not so likely to be found. In Luke's account these words were uttered just after leaving the house of a Pharisee with whom Jesus had dined.<sup>1</sup> It may be that here, as often, the chronology of the evangelists is confused ; or substantially the same words may have been spoken upon two separate occasions. In § 77 leaven was symbolically used with reference only to its expansive and diffusive power ; but here, as in two of Paul's epistles,<sup>2</sup> it is the symbol of corruption. In Luke the leaven of the Pharisees only is spoken of, in Matthew that of the Pharisees and Sadducees, in Mark *the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod*. In Luke the leaven is *hypocrisy*, in Matthew *the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees*, while in Mark there is no explanation of the significance of the word. The disciples, whose minds are yet too dull to take in the spiritual content of the words of Jesus, think that they are cautioned against making bread with leaven prepared by Pharisees. Jesus has to remind them that after what has recently happened they should know that he was not likely to be giving them instructions as to the preparation of bread (*a*).

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 212) Luke is here to be our guide rather than Matthew and Mark who have followed a tradition which adds to and blends with the words of Jesus elements that could have come into the account only after the unhistorical development of the stories of the feeding of the multitudes. With a

<sup>1</sup> See Luke xi., 37.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. 1 Cor. v., 6, 7, 8 ; Gal. v., 9.

recognition of the legendary character of these stories disappears the possibility of Jesus' having made reference to them in the way here reported ; for it is only on the supposition that he meant to call the attention of the disciples to the needlessness of their anxiety concerning food, when he was able in a marvellous way to supply all their wants, that the narrative of Matthew and Mark has any consistency.

### § 109. THE BLIND MAN OF BETHSAIDA.

*Mark viii., 22-26.*

Two striking cures are described by Mark alone,—one that of the stammering deaf man (§ 105), the other that of which an account is here given. In both cases Jesus first of all withdraws the man from the crowd, the only apparent reason for this course being his desire to avoid having attention directed to his work of healing when he is in search of retirement. In both cases, again, there is an agreement in the use of special means and partly of the same means—the application of spittle to the affected parts. Saliva was considered by the ancients to be a curative agent, though not the saliva of all persons.<sup>1</sup> Verse 24 is inconsistent with the idea that this was a case of congenital blindness ; for one born completely blind would not immediately after the receiving of sight have any idea of the appearance either of a man or of a tree. The words of the man indicate that he recognised human forms but without distinguishing between them. Cp. § 134.

<sup>1</sup> Tacitus (*Hist.*, iv., 81) relates of the Emperor Vespasian that he was once entreated by a partially blind man to sprinkle his cheeks and eyes with his saliva, and that, when this was done, the man's sight was restored (*cæco reluxit dies*) ; and he adds that even at the time of his writing there were persons living who of their own knowledge testified to this occurrence. (Cp. 1 Cor. xv., 6.) This, he says, was only one of "many miracles by which the favour of heaven and the good-will of the gods towards Vespasian were shown."

§ 110. CONFESSION OF MESSIAHSHIP, WITH  
PREDICTION OF SUFFERING, DEATH,  
AND RESURRECTION.

*Matt. xvi., 13-23, Mark viii., 27-33; Luke ix., 18-22.*

The scene of this event is the neighbourhood of Cæsarea Philippi, some twenty-five miles north of the lake and near the sources of the Jordan. The evangelists know of no journeying of Jesus farther north than this. Here, being alone with his disciples, he puts to them a question which brings out from Peter as their spokesman a declaration of their belief that he is God's Anointed one. Jesus charges them not to make this known to others and then goes on to say that, instead of being a conquering Messiah, he is to suffer persecution and death, although after three days (or on the third day) he will rise again from the grave. So much is common to all the Synoptics. Matthew alone has preserved the approving words which Jesus addresses to Peter (verses 17-19), but both Matthew and Mark have his rebuke of the boldness of the apostle in taking him aside and chiding him for having uttered such words of discouragement. It is here clearly implied that up to this time there had been no outspoken acknowledgment of the Messiahship of Jesus on the part of his followers and consequently no claiming of Messianic dignity by Jesus himself. While, in saying to Peter that his confession of faith had a divine and not a human source, he acknowledges himself to be the Messiah, what he soon after adds is a virtual declaration that he is not the Messiah of the national hope, since, so far from reigning "over the house of Jacob forever,"<sup>1</sup> he is destined to be rejected by the leading men of his nation and to suffer a violent death. It is not clear that Jesus either expected or wished to draw out from his disciples such a confession as

<sup>1</sup> Luke i., 33.

they made : it is clear that, however much satisfaction it gave him to learn that those who knew him best held him in such high esteem, he felt that their enthusiasm was likely to outrun their discretion and hasten the catastrophe which he saw to be impending ; hence the injunction *that they should tell no man that he was the Christ*. His recent frequent conflicts with the ruling classes had shown him that if he would be a reformer of his nation he must be prepared to be a martyr (a).

When, in speaking to Peter, Jesus calls him Simon Bar-Jonah, that is, " Simon son of John," he uses the name by which the apostle had been known in his earlier life and by which he was still most commonly spoken of and addressed. Mark and Luke say that Jesus named him Peter, while John relates that at the very first interview of Jesus with Simon he gave him the Aramaic name of Cephas, of which Peter is the Greek equivalent.<sup>1</sup> When Jesus says to Simon, *Thou art Peter and on this rock I will build my church*, he makes use of a paronomasia which can be preserved in English only by giving to " Peter " the meaning which belongs to the word when used as a common noun, that is, " rock " or " stone." It is as though Jesus had said, " Your name is Stone and on this stone as a foundation I will build my church." <sup>2</sup> " Church " (*ekklesia*)<sup>3</sup> is a word occurring nowhere else in

<sup>1</sup> Mark iii., 16 ; Luke vi., 14 ; John i., 42. In the Fourth Gospel the double name " Simon Peter " prevails.

<sup>2</sup> The interpretation which makes the " rock " to have been Peter's confession of faith cannot be justified.

<sup>3</sup> *ἐκκλησία*. Primarily and in classical usage it denotes an assembly brought together to attend to public affairs. Three times in the N. T. (Acts xix., 32, 39, 41) it has substantially this meaning : once (Acts vii., 38) it is used with reference to the body of Israelites journeying in the desert. In the O. T. the LXX. often apply it to the general assembly of the people. On the word, see Trench's *Synonyms of the N. T.*, § 1 ; Thayer, 195-6. The English word " church " is derived ultimately from the Gr. adj. *κυριακός* (*kuriakós*) = " belonging to the master."

the Gospels excepting in Matt. xviii., 17, where it is used to designate any local body of Christian believers. Here the joining with it of the word "build"<sup>1</sup> suggests the idea of a complex organism such as did not come into existence during the lifetime of Jesus, and which is thought of as being invulnerable,—for this is what is meant by the declaration that *the gates of Hades*<sup>2</sup> *shall not prevail against it*. What is said about the keys of the kingdom and about binding and loosing receives ample illustration from rabbinical literature.<sup>3</sup> To the rabbis belonged the right to determine what the law allowed and what it disallowed, or, as they expressed it, to bind and to loose. Peter is here constituted an authoritative interpreter of the teaching of his master (*b*).

## NOTES.

(*a*, p. 215) While this anticipation of a violent death may have found expression in the form in which it is reported by the evangelists (since the persons named as judges constituted the court of the Sanhedrin, whose duty it was to see that the interests of the national religion suffered no harm), it is much less likely that Jesus uttered the prophecy ascribed to him concerning his resurrection. So explicit a prediction could not have been misunderstood by the disciples, but would have been remembered, as it was not, after the event had taken place. The very ones who are said to have heard the prophecy acted in every respect as though they were entirely ignorant that such words had ever been uttered. They were completely disheartened at the death of their master, and those who disposed of his body did so in a manner indicative of their having no hope of ever seeing him alive again. Some of his intimate friends and followers were with great difficulty persuaded that he was alive again, even when the fact was amply attested. Later, when fully convinced, they thought not of his prophetic words but of some supposed

<sup>1</sup> In its literal sense the Gr. verb denotes the construction of a house.

<sup>2</sup> See § 89 (*a*).

<sup>3</sup> See Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ, in loco*.

prophecy of Scripture "that he must rise again from the dead." \*

(*b*, p. 216) The authority conferred upon Peter is not, however, exclusive, but is shared by the other apostles.† He is, even in the conception of the First Evangelist, only the most prominent of the disciples, and nowise entitled to lord it over the rest. After the death of Jesus he occupies at Jerusalem no post of superiority, but shares with James and John the reputation of being pillars of the church.‡ When Paul met him at Antioch, instead of treating him as an official superior, he administered to him a stinging rebuke, just as he would have done to any other brother of whose course he did not approve.§ For Jesus to have set Peter above the rest of the twelve would have been to nullify his repeated instructions to them to treat one another as equals.|| These considerations tell strongly against the authenticity of all that Matthew has which is peculiar to him in this section. Although, rightly understood, the passage lends no countenance to the claims of the church of Rome with regard to the absolute primacy of Peter, it does bear distinct marks of having originated at a time when this branch of the Christian church had, in its thought, raised Peter to the post of supreme pontiff. Jesus could hardly have spoken of Peter as under the influence of the Divine Spirit (verse 17) and almost in the next breath (verse 23) have applied to him the name of the arch-tempter and declared that his thoughts were not pleasing to God. In what is said of the invulnerability of the church and its foundation upon Peter the rock, as well as in the fact that the First Evangelist here gives to Peter alone the keys of the kingdom, are traces of the beginning of that exclusive claim for its patron saint which the western church had even thus early begun to put forward. It would seem that we have here an interpolation into the *logia* of Jesus, for which the redactor of Matthew must be held responsible. There is not the slightest historical evidence that Peter ever exercised the function of spiritual dictator to the infant church, which was so much in need of direction after the death of Jesus. On the other hand, if any

\* John xx., 9.

‡ Gal. ii., 9.

† See Matt. xviii., 18; John xx., 23.

§ Gal. ii., 11.

|| See Matt. xx., 25-27, xxiii., 8-12.

one more than another spoke as if by authority, it was Paul, who was not even one of the original apostles.

### § 111. CONDITIONS OF DISCIPLESHIP RESTATED.

*Matt. xvi., 24-28 ; Mark viii., 34-ix., 1 ; Luke ix., 23-27.*

Imbedded in this section we find the substance of § 93. What was there (in Matthew but not in Luke) a part of the charge to the twelve apostles is here addressed to a much wider circle ; for although Matthew speaks only of the *disciples*, he may here use the word in its more comprehensive sense of " followers " (*a*). Employing a phrase found nowhere else in the New Testament, Jesus declares that one who wishes to be his follower must *deny himself*, that is, place the service of God above the gratification of personal desire. That this involves the constant readiness to sacrifice self to duty is more clearly brought out in Luke by the addition of the adverb *daily*. Self-sacrifice for its own sake is not here made a part of Christian obligation. There is in the teaching of Jesus nothing of the monkish idea that virtue consists chiefly in the trampling under foot of all natural desires. The connection of this passage with what has gone before is such as to make it plain that Jesus had in mind only the special conditions of his own time, when to become his confessed disciple necessarily involved a sundering of old ties and an exposure to hardships of many kinds. Of the teaching concerning the losing and the saving of life the first sentence in each of the Synoptics is substantially identical with Matt. x., 39, but what follows is peculiar to the present passage. In the double question (the second part of which is not found in Luke) there is the implication that spiritual good cannot be purchased with any earthly treasure, not even with the sum of the world's wealth. Then comes the declaration that to prefer present ease and safety to the open

avowal of one's faith even in circumstances of danger is to forfeit all claim to be called a follower of Jesus. While in the accounts of all three of the Synoptists there is the declaration that some then living and present will see the establishment of the divine order, of the near coming of which John and Jesus have made proclamation, they do not exactly agree in the way in which they connect this with what has gone before, Matthew having a direct announcement of the fact of this coming, while the others assume that the fact is already known. Again, that which the present generation is to see is variously spoken of as *the kingdom of God* (Luke), *the kingdom of God come with power* (Mark), *the Son of Man coming in his kingdom* (Matthew),—all expressions of identical significance, and the first two explaining what is meant in the preceding verses by the coming of the Son of Man. Matthew's 27th verse especially reflects the conceptions of a later time, when Jesus was expected to return to earth as judge of "the quick and the dead."<sup>1</sup>

## NOTE.

(a, p. 218) While most of § 93 might well have been repeated upon different occasions, yet the fact that Matthew stands alone in making its teachings a part of the address to the twelve, together with the consideration that at so early a date there could have been no reason to suppose that discipleship would involve such a degree of self-sacrifice as is there demanded, renders it probable that the words were not uttered until after the close of the Galilean ministry.

## § 112. THE TRANSFIGURATION.

*Matt. xvii., 1-13 ; Mark ix., 2-13 ; Luke ix., 28-36.*

Six or eight days later Jesus takes Peter, James, and John with him up into some mountain, presumably in the same

<sup>1</sup> See Acts x., 42 ; 2 Tim. iv., 1 ; 1 Pet. iv., 5.



region. Here he undergoes a striking change of appearance, his form becoming wonderfully resplendent, while at the same time two Old Testament worthies, Moses and Elijah, appear on the scene and enter into conversation with him. Peter proposes to build booths for Jesus and the two visitors to abide in. A heavenly voice out of a cloud announces, as at the baptism, the divine sonship of Jesus. Then suddenly the three disciples find themselves alone with their master. This is the skeleton of the story of the transfiguration as told by all the Synoptists. In Luke alone the subject of the conversation with Moses and Elijah is said to have been the impending death of Jesus at Jerusalem. Luke again is alone in mentioning that it was for the purpose of engaging in prayer that Jesus had ascended the mountain, and that it was when his three companions had just awakened from sleep that they observed the splendour of his appearance and the presence of the two visitants. Matthew and Mark add that, as they were coming down from the mountain, Jesus enjoined silence as to the "vision" until after his resurrection; Luke simply says that they did not at that time tell the story to anyone. Matthew and Mark represent James and John as inquiring what they are to think about the expected return of Elijah to the earth before the coming of the Messiah. Jesus tells them that John the Baptist was Elijah, meaning that the expected function of the old prophet had been already performed by the preacher of the wilderness and that they were to look for no personal appearing of Elijah (*a*).

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 220) There are three different ways of looking upon the story of the transfiguration. (1) It may be taken, as intended by the evangelists, for a simple record of historical fact. (2) It is maintained by some that, while it may have had a foundation in fact, some of its details must be unhistorical. (3) It may be understood as embodying certain ideas in a poetical form. To (1) there is the objection that

it involves the recognition of elements of which, since they lie without the known realm of natural law, human history can take no cognisance. It offers no explanation of any of the strange physical phenomena reported, unless the "materialisation" theory of modern Spiritism is first accepted as resting upon a solid foundation. (2), which implies a misunderstood historical event, is most plausibly developed by tracing the entire vision to an exceptional experience of Peter, who, it is supposed, upon awakening\* saw for a moment objectified before him Moses and Elijah who had just before been present to him in his dreams. Into this explanation enters as a psychological factor the suggestion of the dream by the way in which Jesus had received Peter's declaration of his Messiahship. (3) The mythical explanation makes use of the same psychological elements as the hypothesis last considered, though handling them in an altogether different way. It is conceived that the transfiguration of Jesus took place only in the minds of his disciples, and especially of the chosen three, whose admiration and reverence for their master was now raised to the highest pitch of enthusiasm by the recognition of his Messiahship, the announcement of which had been to them as it were a voice from heaven. It was the character and mission of Jesus which were suddenly illumined with a divine light, and not his body. Since in him the law and the prophets were to have their fulfilment, it was as though Moses† and Elijah talked with him and through him gave their message to the men of that generation. But athwart the brightness of this joy fell the shadow of the cross.

\* Luke's expression, *βεβαρημένοι ὕπνῳ*, "weighed down (or overcome) with sleep" (E. V., "heavy with sleep"), may possibly imply only very great drowsiness; but cp. Matt. xxvi., 43, "sleeping, for their eyes were heavy" (*βεβαρημένοι*), where the closing of the eyes in sleep is plainly intended.

For a full development of this second hypothesis, see Furness's *Jesus and his Biographers*.

† Into some forms of this hypothesis the experience of Moses on Mount Sinai enters as a factor, an effort to liken Jesus to the great lawgiver being supposed.

## § 113. RELIEF OF AN EPILEPTIC YOUTH.

*Matt. xvii., 14-21; Mark ix., 14-29; Luke ix., 37-43a, xvii., 5, 6.*

Upon joining the rest of his disciples Jesus finds them involved in a controversy with some of the scribes and also in the predicament of having failed in their efforts to cure a demoniac whom Matthew describes as "epileptic."<sup>1</sup> Various symptoms are mentioned by the different evangelists, but none which are at variance with the idea that the youth was really an epileptic. While the account bears testimony to the relieving of the sufferer by Jesus, it says nothing as to the degree of permanency of the cure. What is most significant in the narrative is the stress laid upon the need of faith if one would grapple successfully with a difficulty of this kind. The omnipotence of faith is set forth in the language of hyperbole, the figures used being such as must have been familiar to those addressed. To have faith *as a grain of mustard-seed* is to have it in small measure,—as we might say, to have "the least grain of it."<sup>2</sup> To remove mountains is simply to do that which might at first sight seem impossible.<sup>3</sup> The culmination of hyperbole is reached in the statement that with faith nothing whatever will be impossible to the disciples. In Mark prayer also is spoken of as a necessary condition of success.

## § 114. JESUS AGAIN PREDICTS HIS FATE.

*Matt. xvii., 22, 23; Mark ix., 30-32; Luke ix., 43b-45.*

The prediction of § 110 is here repeated, although in Luke only the arrest is spoken of and not the death and resurrec-

<sup>1</sup> Cp. *Matt. iv., 24* (§ 22), the only other place in the N. T. where the word thus translated is to be found.

<sup>2</sup> See Lightfoot's *Horæ Hebraicæ*, on *Matt. xiii., 22*.

<sup>3</sup> See *Zech. iv., 7*; *1 Cor. xiii., 2*; and Lightfoot's *Hor. Heb.*, on *Matt. xxi., 21*.

tion. Returning from the north Jesus comes again into Galilee, but not to resume his public ministry. Now he seeks to be alone with his disciples, for he has that to say to them which it is not wise to intrust to the public ear (*a*).

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 223) There seems to be some confusion in the narrative at this point; for if the previous prediction had been understood (and the fact that Peter protested that it should not be accomplished shows that he took in its meaning), there was no need of its repetition, and, if repeated, it could not have failed to be comprehended, which Mark and Luke report to have been the case, although Matthew's statement that *they were exceeding sorry* implies again a full understanding of the prediction. Of these conflicting statements that one must be accepted which seems in itself most probable, and it is only on the supposition that the death and subsequent resurrection were altogether unforeseen by his disciples that we can account for their joyous journeying to Jerusalem and their entering into the city with shouts of triumph. See § 110 (*a*), p. 216.

## § 115. THE TEMPLE-TAX.

*Matt xvii., 24-27.*

After the return from the Babylonish captivity the tax imposed by the old law<sup>1</sup> for the support of the services of religion was revived, and every Jew was required to pay annually a half-shekel<sup>2</sup> toward the maintenance of the temple-worship. In foreign money this amounted to two Attic drachmas; hence in Greek the question put to Peter takes the form, "Does not your teacher pay the *didrachms*?"<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ex. xxx., 13.

<sup>2</sup> The shekel of Jerusalem was a silver coin of 220 grains and therefore worth about 60 cents of American money, or a little less than two shillings and sixpence sterling.

<sup>3</sup> A Septuagint word. See Gen. xxiii., 15, 16; Josh. vii., 21.

Jesus feels that the mission in which he and his disciples are engaged should exempt them from such a claim ; yet, rather than have any difficulty with the temple authorities, he instructs Peter to pay the tax for them both. Judas, the treasurer<sup>1</sup> of their company, is not, however, to be called upon for the money, but Peter the fisherman is to catch a particular fish in whose mouth he will find a "stater," just the amount needed. It is left to be inferred that Peter did as directed and procured the money in this novel way (*a*).

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 224) The narrative also implies that Jesus either placed in the mouth of a particular fish in the Sea of Galilee a certain coin—a Greek coin, which it was not lawful to put into the temple treasury—or that he knew that there would be by chance such a coin in the mouth of the first fish which Peter should catch, and that the coin would not be lost, as might be expected, when the fish took the hook.\* If the coin was to be created outright by some such power as Jesus was supposed to have manifested in the increase of the loaves and fishes, there could still be no conceivable reason for getting it into the hand of Peter in such a roundabout way; besides, it was not the custom of Jesus to make a display of what he did. Anyone who is not content to rest in the simple conviction that the credulity of the evangelist prevented him from distinguishing between fact and fiction has the opportunity of choosing between several hypotheses, some of which assume the transformation of myth or legend into history, while others find in the story a perverted narrative of fact. It is worth while to mention here only the most plausible explanation of the latter kind,—that what Jesus really told Peter was to catch some fish and by selling them procure the necessary money, the Greek verb translated "find" meaning also to "bring" or "sell for."†

<sup>1</sup> See John xii., 6, xiii., 29.

\* Fishing with a hook is nowhere else spoken of in the N. T., but there are several instances of the use of a drag-net: Matt. iv., 18, xiii., 47; Mark i., 16; Luke v., 5, 6; John xxi., 6, 8, 11.

† The way in which this transformation of meaning may have taken

## § 116. THE STRIFE FOR PRECEDENCE.

*Matt. xviii., 1-5 ; Mark ix., 33-37 ; Luke ix., 46-48.*

There are here the usual minor differences in the three accounts. What is material is that Jesus condemned in the twelve that selfish spirit which led each to desire for himself the highest place of honour in the Messianic kingdom. Incidentally he gives them an object-lesson in modesty by taking a little child in his arms and declaring it to be the type of the true Christian disciple. They are assured that service to others, as opposed to self-seeking, gives the highest claim to honour. In Matthew this is stated even more strongly, since it is declared that one lacking this attribute of childlikeness can acquire no right of citizenship in the heavenly kingdom. All the Synoptists make Jesus say in conclusion that to receive such a childlike disciple with a recognition of the fact that this spirit of helpful service is the very essence of Christian discipleship, is equivalent to receiving not only him but the Father who sent him. When Luke says *this little child* he must be referring, unless he misunderstood the

place in the repetition of the story can be thus illustrated : In the uncial MSS. the text stands as follows, without space between the two words: ΕΙΡΗΣΕΙΣΣΤΑΤΗΡΑ (*ēurēsēis|statēra*), "you will find | a stater." Were the consonant (*s*) absent from the end of the first word, the meaning would be "it will bring | a stater." Supposing this last reading to have been the original, it would have been easy, considering the difficulty which the ear often has in distinguishing between two consecutive sibilants and a simple continuous one, to mistake the third person of the verb for the second and so, when writing, to insert an additional Σ (*s*), thus unintentionally corrupting the text and so perverting its meaning. (In the same manner, to illustrate by an English example, "the son soon came," if pronounced rapidly, might be mistaken for "the sons soon came.") When the story had once been thus far transformed, the next step would be the answering of the natural inquiry as to where the coin would be found by saying, "In the fish's mouth."

meaning of Jesus, not to the person but the characteristics of the child as representative of the true spirit of discipleship; for *in my name*<sup>1</sup> is here equivalent to "because he is my disciple," while Christian discipleship cannot be predicated of an infant.

### § 117. THE WONDER-WORKING STRANGER.

*Mark ix., 38-41; Luke ix., 49-50.*

John is represented as reporting to his master<sup>2</sup> that someone not of their number is casting out demons in his name. By *in thy name* is meant "claiming to be thy disciple." There is no intimation that, as some have thought, this stranger used the name of Jesus to conjure with, unless we are to suppose that the disciples of Jesus did the same thing. Neither is there any reason for doubting that the evangelists supposed, and intended to represent Jesus as supposing, that the man actually cured demoniacism. This independent worker even receives a glad recognition from Jesus as being virtually his disciple, and the narrow exclusiveness of the twelve in interfering with his work is distinctly rebuked by him in the statement that whoever is doing good in whatever way is in reality their helper. In Mark are the two additional statements that it is morally impossible for one to do Christ's work and in the same breath speak ill of him, and that even to perform so slight a service as to give a cup of water to a thirsty disciple of his made the giver also a true disciple, even though he might keep aloof from him in whose service he was really laboring.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Matt. x., 22 (§ 90).

<sup>2</sup> In Luke *ἐπιστάτα* (*ēpistatā*), "master," is six times used in addressing Jesus, but the word is found nowhere else in the N. T. Mark here and Luke generally has the common *διδάσκαλε* (*didaskalē*), "teacher" = "rabbi."

## § 118. OF STUMBLING-BLOCKS.

*Matt. xviii., 6-9; Mark ix., 42-50; Luke xvii., 1, 2.*

In Matthew there is a good connection with § 116, which in Mark is broken by § 117. Over against those who receive the disciples of Jesus in a spirit of helpfulness are now placed those who put temptations in their way and so hinder their progress in the higher life. In Luke there is a wide gap between the two preceding sections and this. The heinousness of the offence of leading others into sin is set forth in striking rhetorical form. Stated simply the declaration is that it were better for one to lose his life than to be the cause of spiritual harm to others. Under present conditions temptations will exist, but alas for ' the tempter! From stumbling-blocks put in the way of disciples by others Jesus passes (in Matthew and Mark) to temptations coming from within.<sup>2</sup> To be " cast into Gehenna " being the opposite of to " enter into life " is to be understood not of punishment but of the loss of the higher life. It is better, says Jesus, to make a sacrifice of bodily indulgence rather than to endanger the welfare of the soul. What was constantly going on in the valley of Hinnom furnishes Mark with the realistic language of his 48th verse.<sup>3</sup> The meaning of verses 49 and 50 is very obscure. Especially is it difficult to establish any satisfactory connection between verse 50 and what has gone before. Rejecting, with the best modern editors, the clause " and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt,"<sup>4</sup> we lose all direct reference to the Old Testament injunction with regard to the salting of sacrifices,<sup>5</sup> but thereby make it pos-

<sup>1</sup> On *οὐαί*, " alas for," see § 35, p. 99.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. § 39, pp. 106, 107.

<sup>3</sup> See § 38 (a), p. 106.

<sup>4</sup> Found in the T. R. and A. V. It probably crept in as a gloss.

<sup>5</sup> See Lev. ii., 13.



sible to identify the "fire" of verse 49 with the fire of Gehenna of the preceding verses and to make "every one" include only those<sup>1</sup> referred to in verse 48 as cast into the undying fire. To be "salted with fire" will then be to be consumed in the fire of Gehenna. With this understanding of the passage there is no real advance upon the thought of the preceding verses, but only a statement of it in a new form (*a*). If verse 50 is rightly placed here, the salt losing its saltiness may be considered typical of that loss of fraternal spirit which led the twelve to quarrel about precedence, and the injunction to *have salt* in themselves will then be an injunction to preserve the true spirit of Christian brotherhood.

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 228) The chief objection to this interpretation is that in the next verse salt is a saving agent and not associated with the idea of destruction. Considering that we have only Mark's authority for introducing verse 50 in this connection, and that he may have placed it here simply because of the mention of salting in verse 49, or perhaps also because the final injunction to be at peace with one another seemed to be related to verses 33-37 and to make a fitting conclusion to the whole discourse, it is better to recognise the lack of any relation of thought between the two verses than to give up what seems the most natural understanding of the phrase "to be salted with fire."

## § 119. GOD'S INTEREST IN THE INDIVIDUAL HUMAN SOUL.

*Matt. xviii., 10-14; Luke xv., 1-10.*

Matthew and Luke have different introductions to the parable of the lost sheep, which may indicate either that the same illustration was used by Jesus on different occasions and for different purposes, or that the arrangement of one or the

<sup>1</sup> αἱ τρεῖς.

other of the two evangelists is at fault.<sup>1</sup> In Matthew it is the humble disciple, "one of these little ones," whom the lost sheep typifies; in Luke it is those whom the scribes and Pharisees call "sinners." Matthew here has the only allusion to guardian angels to be found in the New Testament, unless possibly Acts xii., 15, may furnish another example. In pre-exilian Jewish literature there is no recognition of protecting spirits. In saying that the angels of "these little ones" constantly stand in the Divine presence Jesus intimates that those whom God thus honours are especially dear to Him. In the application of the parable in Luke (verse 7) the "sinner" must be one who has really strayed from the path of virtue, and not merely one who is a sinner only in the eyes of the self-righteous. The natural anxiety of a human parent for the recovery of an erring child, which for the moment swallows up all other interests, is anthropopathically ascribed to the Deity. As in the first parable so in the second, the loss of that which one values and the joy which follows the finding of it is that in which the whole force of the illustration resides.

#### § 120. DUTIES AND PRIVILEGES OF CHRISTIAN BROTHERHOOD.

*Matt. xviii., 15-22; Luke xvii., 3, 4.*

From offences against his "little ones" Jesus passes to a consideration of the way in which his followers should treat each other. In cases in which they have been injured by a brother they are to consider carefully their own conduct and regulate it according to the principles of Christian charity. The simple injunction in Luke to forgive a repentant offender

<sup>1</sup> It is difficult, if not impossible, to trace in Matthew any connection between the parable and the preceding context; for it is only by forcing the figure that Christ's "little ones" can be thought of as "lost sheep."

takes on in Matthew an extended form, in part assimilated to a Mosaic prescription.<sup>1</sup> When all efforts at reconciliation have proved fruitless because of the contumacy of the offender, and even the authority of the church<sup>2</sup> has been disregarded, then nothing remains to be done but to look upon him as having forfeited by his conduct all right to be considered a Christian brother. The "you" of verse 18 are simply the twelve<sup>3</sup>; to them, as heads of the church, Jesus gives authority to settle all matters in dispute.<sup>4</sup> To show still further his confidence in his chosen disciples he declares that the concurrent judgment of even two of them shall be authoritative, since, having been instructed by him, they know the spirit in which he would have them act. Just here Peter, perhaps thinking to show his magnanimity, asks Jesus how many times one shall forgive an offending brother—whether as many as seven times.<sup>5</sup> The numbers both in the question and in the answer are only "round numbers" used as symbols. Theophylact interprets wisely when he says: "Not that he [Jesus] would limit forgiveness by a number, but thereby he indicates its boundlessness; as if he had said, 'As often as one offends and repents, forgive him.'"

## § 121. THE PARABLE OF THE UNFORGIVING SERVANT

*Matt. xviii., 23-35.*

This parable illustrates the teaching of the preceding section, but with the addition of the thought that he who does

<sup>1</sup> Deut. xix., 15.

<sup>2</sup> See § 110, comment and Note on ἐκκλησία.      <sup>3</sup> See xviii., 1.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. § 110, comment and (b). In Roman Catholic usage "the church" is the collective body of the clergy.

<sup>5</sup> In the Babylonish Talmud it is said that he who sins against another is forgiven once, twice, thrice, but not four times; so that, with reference to the judgment of his time, Peter really sets up an exceptionally high standard.

not show a forgiving disposition toward his brother-man cannot expect the Divine forgiveness for his own shortcomings. The servant<sup>1</sup> whom the king calls to account is to be thought of as some governor of a province or other high official who has large sums of money intrusted to his care, for the amount which he owes is equivalent to ten millions of dollars. What his fellow-servant owes him is the comparatively insignificant sum of seventeen dollars.<sup>2</sup> Although among the Jews as elsewhere an insolvent debtor and even his family might be sold into servitude, the Mosaic law mercifully modified the rigour of the penalty by affixing to it definite limits of time.<sup>3</sup> Chrysostom's interpretation of the last part of verse 34, "that is, forever, for he will never be able to pay," is still received with favour by some critics; but this handling of the passage not only introduces an unwarrantable inference but perverts the meaning of the parable by withdrawing attention from the only point intended to be emphasised—the duty of forgiving as we hope to be forgiven.

### § 122. HEROD THE FOX.

*Luke xiii., 31-33.*

Beyond the mere fact that Jesus was told at this time by certain Pharisees that Herod had murderous designs against him, nothing definite concerning the situation can be learned from what Luke here says. From the reply of Jesus, how-

<sup>1</sup> While *δοῦλος* (*dōulōs*), to which the margin of the R. V. always assigns the meaning of "bond-servant," is probably related to the verb *δέω*, "to bind," its application is not limited to those who are in bondage. Under ancient Oriental despotisms every one was a *δοῦλος* to the sovereign—even those closely related to him by blood. Thus the younger Cyrus, in Xen., *Anab.*, i., 7, 3, speaks of himself as the *δοῦλος* of his brother the king.

<sup>2</sup> On the translation "pence" see p. 244, Note <sup>3</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> See 2 Kings iv., 1, and cp. Lev., xxv., 39 ff.; Ex. xxi., 2 ff.

ever, in which Herod is spoken of as a fox,<sup>1</sup> it is not unreasonable to infer that the king, desirous of getting the supposed agitator of the people out of his dominion without the use of violence, enlisted in his service some of the Pharisees who were also quite willing to be rid of the troublesome innovating rabbi. It can hardly be, as some suppose, that the Pharisees acted altogether upon their own motion in informing Jesus of the disposition of Herod toward him, of which they had learned indirectly ; for in that case there would have been no reason for calling Herod a fox. To the subtle indirection of the king Jesus opposes a bold frankness, declaring that he shall take what time he needs for the finishing of the work which he has planned. Whether he designed to include this work within three days of twenty-four hours, or used a technical form of speech which had no such definite meaning, it does not seem possible to determine. If the translation *I am perfected*,<sup>2</sup> in the sense of "I am to be put to death," is to be received, then the latter view must be adopted ; if the sense is "I finish [my work]," then the three days may be taken literally.

<sup>1</sup> Greek writers not infrequently used the fox as a symbol of craftiness and cunning, but the present is the only instance in the N. T. of the tropical use of the word.

<sup>2</sup> The R. V. follows the A. V. except in substituting "am" for "shall be." The Revisers would have done well to place in the margin "I finish," which is approved by good authorities. It is not credible that Jesus should have sent word to Herod that he was about to be put to death in Jerusalem. He might, however, have said that if he was to be put to death anywhere it ought to be in Jerusalem, which was famous for the killing of prophets, and whither he was about to go.

## § 123. THE DEPARTURE FOR JERUSALEM.

*Matt. xix., 1, 2; Mark x., 1; Luke ix., 51-56.*

Luke, here in possession of special information,<sup>1</sup> relates an incident which occurred just as Jesus was about to set out on his journey toward Jerusalem, which was not long before his death,—for by his being *received up* is meant his ascension into heaven.<sup>2</sup> That Jesus should take the unusual precaution of sending out messengers to arrange in advance for a hospitable reception is easily accounted for by the fact of the increasing number of his followers, which, before reaching Jerusalem, amounted to a “multitude.”<sup>3</sup> While Matthew and Mark announce only the departure from Galilee into the region across the Jordan, which lay over against Judæa, Luke lets us know that it was at first purposed to go to Jerusalem by the more direct route through Samaria, and that it was the inhospitality of the Samaritans which led to a change of plan. There was no love lost between the Jews and the Samaritans, and it is not strange that a large company travelling toward Jerusalem not long before the passover feast should not everywhere be treated with courtesy. Those who worshipped only on Mt. Gerizim were not likely to be altogether friendly to those who insisted that in Jerusalem was “the place where men ought to worship.”<sup>4</sup> Some violent language of James and John, which can hardly have been in the exact form given to it by the evangelist, is rebuked by Jesus, who prefers to go another way rather than force himself upon those who are

<sup>1</sup> From the style of the opening sentence its source would seem to have been some Aramaic document.

<sup>2</sup> How much time this journey occupied and what was the exact course, the brief and confused narrative of the Synoptics gives us no means of determining.

<sup>3</sup> See Luke xix., 37.

<sup>4</sup> John iv., 20.

unwilling to receive him. The *other village* spoken of in verse 56 may have been in Samaria ; but it is more likely that after such a repulse he immediately left the country and, as Matthew and Mark say, went into Peræa, where he resumed his work of teaching and healing. Strict Jews from northern Palestine who were afraid of being defiled by coming into contact with the Samaritans were accustomed to journey to the Holy City by this longer route.

#### § 124. SACRIFICES DEMANDED OF FOLLOWERS OF JESUS.

*Matt. viii., 19-22 ; Luke ix., 57-62.*

When a scribe proposes to join the company of the disciples he is informed that this will involve giving up the comforts of life to which he has been accustomed, since now the Teacher, journeying to Jerusalem, has no fixed abode to which to welcome him. The context, however, seems to indicate that what Jesus really said was that " man " (not the " son of man " in any sense in which the term was applicable to him more than to anyone else in his situation), when living a wandering life like that of himself and his disciples, cannot always readily find shelter, as do birds and beasts in trees and holes in the ground, but must constantly be prepared to suffer from exposure. Another, already a disciple, when invited by Jesus to accompany him, offers what might seem to be a valid excuse for remaining behind. The reply of Jesus, who cannot be imagined to have spoken harshly upon an occasion of actual bereavement,<sup>1</sup> means at least this, that if the would-be follower is to join the ranks of those whose faces are set toward Jerusalem, no delay for any cause is possible. Those who are without interest in the

<sup>1</sup> It has been conjectured that the man's father was not dead but only seriously ill, and that the request was for permission to remain at home as long as the father lived.

proclamation of the good news (the spiritually dead) may well be left to attend to all matters pertaining to this present life. The significance of the third incident, described only in Luke, lies in the proverbial language of the reply of Jesus.<sup>1</sup>

§ 125. MARY AND MARTHA AND OTHER WOMEN DISCIPLES.

*Luke viii., 1-3, x., 38-42.*

Of the many women found in the retinue of Jesus three only are here mentioned by name, and only one of these is again referred to in the Gospels—Mary Magdalene, whose surname probably indicates the place either of her birth or of her residence. This Mary occupies a prominent position in the story of the latest events of the life of Jesus. The common impression that she was the “sinner” spoken of in Luke vii., 37, has no foundation whatever.<sup>2</sup> About Joanna, once more mentioned by Luke (xxiv., 10), and Susanna, not elsewhere spoken of, nothing is known. Once, at least, in his journeying Jesus accepts for himself the hospitality of friends. The Fourth Gospel<sup>3</sup> tells us that Bethany was the village where Mary and Martha lived, by whom Jesus was received. When Martha would call Mary from her conversation with Jesus to assist her in her household duties, Jesus gently chides her for her unnecessary anxiety to provide for him a better repast, declaring that but little is needed and

<sup>1</sup> The conciseness as well as the apparent isolation of these narratives has led some critics to suppose that we have here a presentation of three peculiar types of disciples rather than a record of historical facts.

<sup>2</sup> To this false notion is due the coinage of the English word “mag-dalen.”

<sup>3</sup> John xi., 1.



that Mary is doing better than to busy herself about the preparation of food.<sup>1</sup>

§ 126. ANSWER OF JESUS TO A QUESTION  
CONCERNING DIVORCE.<sup>2</sup>

*Matt. xix., 3-12; Mark x., 2-12.*

The question here discussed is not stated in precisely the same form by both evangelists, the significant words *for every cause* appearing only in Matthew. In Mark the question is whether divorce is ever right; in Matthew, whether it is right for a man to repudiate his wife at will. In the answers there is a corresponding difference. In Mark all divorce is condemned; in Matthew, marital unfaithfulness, which is *ipso facto* a breaking of the marriage bond, is recognised as a sufficient cause for separation. It is, however, not unlikely that in this respect Matthew correctly and Mark imperfectly reproduces the teaching of the *logia*. It is intimated by both Matthew and Mark that the Pharisees had some ulterior design in thus questioning Jesus, but what this purpose was we are left to conjecture. It may be supposed to have had some relation to the standing controversy upon this point between the two rabbinical schools of interpretation. The plan of the Pharisees, whatever it was, miscarried through Jesus' taking the case out of the jurisdiction of the Mosaic law, to which they had appealed, and carrying it to a higher tribunal. Moses, he says, allowed divorce as a concession to human weakness, but in so doing set up human against divine authority. Citing the first book of the law<sup>3</sup> he places marriage upon the immovable foundation

<sup>1</sup> There is no reason for supposing that we have here only an allegory in which the contemplative life is set over against the life of action, or faith contrasted with works to the disadvantage of the latter.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. § 39.

<sup>3</sup> Gen. i., 27, ii., 24. In their original connection the words of the

of the primal purpose of creation as manifested in the typical union of the first human pair. According to Matthew the decisive declaration of Jesus against divorce led the disciples to say that it were better not to marry at all than to be thus bound. To this Jesus gives only a qualified assent, saying that, while some may properly refrain from marriage *for the kingdom of heaven's sake*, not all have this power of continence.<sup>1</sup>

### § 127 JESUS AND THE CHILDREN.

*Matt. xix., 13-15; Mark x., 13-16; Luke xviii., 15-17.*

The purpose of those who brought to Jesus little children (Luke says "babes") was that they might receive from his touch some of that virtue which was supposed not only to reside in men of peculiar sanctity but to be capable of being communicated by them to others. In Matthew and Mark the idea is somewhat enlarged, since prayer, or blessing, and a laying on of hands are spoken of, and not simply touching. Whatever may have been the motive of the disciples in endeavouring to prevent the children from being brought to Jesus, his words to them are a recognition of the purity, simplicity, and teachableness of childhood as traits the absence of which in manhood disqualifies for citizenship in the kingdom of heaven. But, apart from this lesson, the personal interest of Jesus in little children plainly appears in his kindly treatment of them and especially in his taking them into his arms, as he, when a babe, had been received into the arms of the aged Simeon in the temple.<sup>2</sup>

second quotation are strangely ascribed to Adam (who at that time could not have anticipated the existence of posterity), and not, as in Matthew, to the Creator. In Mark the quotations are not referred to any source, although they are easily recognised as quotations by the use which Jesus immediately makes of them.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. 1 Cor. vii., 9.

<sup>2</sup> See Luke ii., 28.

# § 128. PERILS ATTENDING THE POSSESSION OF WEALTH.

*Matt. xix., 16-30; Mark x., 17-31; Luke xviii., 18-30, xxii., 28-30.*

In their several reports of the colloquy with which this section opens, the Synoptic writers do not agree as to the terms of the reply of Jesus to the question asked him, neither exactly as to the question itself. According to Matthew, the questioner does not in saluting Jesus apply to him the epithet "good," as he is represented as doing in the accounts of Mark and Luke, but, addressing him simply as "teacher," asks what "good thing" he shall do (*a*). To the question in this form Jesus is represented as expressing surprise that the young man<sup>1</sup> should not know that, since God is the supreme good, the only good thing is to do His will. In the form in which the question is reported by Mark and Luke Jesus refuses to be called good, on the ground that goodness can fitly be predicated of God alone. When Jesus cites from the law<sup>2</sup> certain provisions of the Decalogue in answer to the question what commandments one must keep in order to *inherit eternal life*, he is not to be understood as laying special stress upon these particular commands, but only as mentioning by way of example those which came first to his mind; as though he had said "such as these." The command not to defraud (found only in Mark) cannot be traced to any single Old Testament source, but represents the spirit of several passages. Matthew also makes Jesus go outside of the Decalogue in quoting from Lev. xix., 18, the injunction concerning neighbour-love (*b*). Two things more Jesus demands of the young ruler who declares that he has always been obedient to the commands of the law,—that he shall

<sup>1</sup> Matthew alone thus speaks of him; Luke calls him a ruler.

<sup>2</sup> Ex. xx.

devote his great wealth to the service of the poor, and that he shall join those who are proclaiming the gospel of the kingdom—the second course being the natural sequel of the first, although from Mark we might infer that Jesus longed to have him for a companion because of his lovable traits of character. The test of the sacrifice of his wealth proved too severe a one for his moral strength and so justified the demand of Jesus ; for, under existing conditions, nothing less than complete self-surrender was consistent with devotion to the cause for which the Master was ready to sacrifice even his life. When Jesus emphasises the dangers which attend the possession of wealth by saying that *it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God*, he employs hyperbole, making use of an illustration likely to have been familiar to the twelve.<sup>1</sup> He seems to them by this saying to have shut completely the door to the kingdom, but he reassures them by declaring that what humanly speaking is impossible Divine Power can accomplish. Their conception of the Messianic kingdom was such that they could not conceive of the possibility of its establishment without that help which the rich and powerful alone could give. Not yet did they understand the true nature of the mission of Jesus. Their lack of spiritual apprehension further manifests itself in the inquiry of Peter (who, as usual, speaks for his associates as well as for himself) as to what they are to have as their compensation for having sacrificed everything to become his followers.<sup>2</sup> As

<sup>1</sup> Cp. these two passages from the rabbinical literature : "They do not show a man a palm-tree of gold, nor an elephant going through the eye of a needle" ; "Perhaps thou art one of those of Pumbeditha, who can make an elephant pass through the eye of a needle."

<sup>2</sup> It is only Matthew who puts this question into the mouth of Peter as a sequel to his remark concerning their self-sacrifice. The query may have been inserted by some early transcriber for the purpose of bringing out explicitly what seemed to be suggested by the preceding statement.

in § 69 Jesus had recognised as his "brother and sister and mother," in the truest sense of these terms, whoever did the will of God, so now he declares that the establishment of new relations of spiritual kinship will more than make up to his disciples for their loss of the friendship of those most closely bound to them by family ties, and that in the "coming age" the *eternal*<sup>2</sup> *life* will be theirs. Mark's 30th verse contains details not found in Matthew and Luke and which look like an expansion of the *logia* by the introduction of the particulars of the preceding verse, which they follow in every respect excepting one. The "fields" which the disciples are promised can only be a share of the products of the fields of the many who have retained their possessions and who will hospitably entertain the apostles upon their journeyings, and "mothers," in the plural, points distinctly to the spiritual relationship above spoken of. Accompanying persecutions are, however, spoken of, as though Jesus would not have his disciples suppose that their lot in the present time is to be altogether a joyous one. The promise in Matthew is of a different sort and looks solely to the future for its fulfilment. "The coming age" of Mark and Luke is here "the regeneration" or "palingenesis" (*palingēnēsia*<sup>3</sup>), the time when the kingdom of heaven shall have been established. This time is depicted in Messianic language as the rule of the Son of Man, under which the twelve are to have posts of responsibility and honour. If Jesus had ever had hopes of sitting upon the throne of David (of which no evidence has yet presented itself), this expectation must have altogether vanished before he could have uttered the predictions

<sup>1</sup> See § 66 (a), p. 150.

<sup>2</sup> Not "everlasting," as in A. V., for which the proper Gr. term is *αἰδιος*, in N. T. only in Rom. i., 20; Jude 6. See pp. 150, 151.

<sup>3</sup> *παλιγγενεσί* Not found in classical Greek nor in any of the ancient Gr. versions of the O. T. In the N. T. again only in Tit. iii., 5, in a different sense. See Thayer, 474.

of his early death found in §§ 110, 114. Whatever he may have said, of which the present passage is a more or less accurate report, the only interpretation of these words which is consistent with the general tenor of his teaching makes the utterance a highly figurative description of the participation of the twelve in the work of the world's regeneration (*c*). To Matthew's figure of the throne Luke adds, though not in the same connection, that of the royal banquet, by which the coming kingdom is often symbolised in the Gospels. The closing words in Matthew and Mark are an intimation that those who were the first to become the disciples of Jesus are not to base upon this circumstance an expectation of necessarily being first in the kingdom of God, for many late comers may attain to a higher rank than they.

## NOTES.

(*a*, p. 238) Internal evidence of the corruption either of the text or of the primitive tradition is not wanting. That Jesus should reject the title of "good" would not be consonant with the feelings of the early church, even though their veneration for him had not yet resulted in his deification. Matthew's text evinces an effort to get rid of that which was objectionable in the traditional form of the question of Jesus, — an effort so imperfect as to leave the accompanying declaration substantially in its original form, in which it is fitly connected only with the unaltered interrogation.

(*b*, p. 238) It was, perhaps, because of its not being in the Decalogue that *do not defraud* failed to find a place in Matthew and Luke. On the other hand, Matthew's addition, *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*, being more in the prevailing spirit of the gospel than of the law, may have been an interpolation of the redactor.

(*c*, p. 241) The judgment of some critics that the passage is an interpolation may perhaps be justified on the ground of its apocalyptic character, but cannot properly be based upon a supposed lack of suitable connection; for, as above interpreted, it constitutes a fitting reply to the question of Peter, even though it could not be comprehended by the twelve in its true meaning.

§ 129. THE PARABLE OF THE PROVIDENT STEWARD, WITH A REBUKE OF PHARISAIC AVARICE AND CONCEIT.

*Luke xvi., 1-12, 14, 15.*

The significance of this parable has often been missed through a failure to bear in mind this fundamental principle of parabolic teaching, that in almost every case it is intended to serve but a single purpose—the illustration of a particular truth. It is not the knavery of the steward which his master commends, but his shrewdness and worldly wisdom. Verse 8 plainly shows this. “The sons of the age,” Jesus says, show a degree of forethought in their dealings with their fellow-men which “the sons of the kingdom” would do well to imitate. In verse 9 Jesus makes an immediate application of the parables to his disciples (who are here more than the twelve), counselling them so to use their wealth,<sup>1</sup> not selfishly but for the good of others, as to promote the interests of that higher life which depends not upon the enjoyment of worldly possessions. The following words depict the consequences of proving unfaithful to their trust. The selfish and therefore unrighteous use of riches will bring one to spiritual poverty. In verse 12, by *that which is another's* is meant this world's goods, which God intrusts to men as His stewards; by *your own*, the blessings which naturally follow obedience to the law of God. Verses 14 and 15 constitute a pendant not only to the immediately preceding parable, but to what had been said<sup>2</sup> before this concerning the dangers attending the possession of wealth.

<sup>1</sup> “Mammon” is not personified here, as in § 49, which see.

<sup>2</sup> *πάντα ταῦτα*, “all these things.”

## § 130. THE PARABLE OF THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

*Luke xvi., 19-31.*

It is the purpose of this parable to depict the consequences of the selfish use of wealth : there is, therefore, a close connection with what has gone before. This is the only parable of Jesus in which the names of persons appear. There are three *dramatis personæ*,—a rich man, whose name is not given, although in later literature he is often referred to as “Dives”<sup>1</sup>; a beggar named Lazarus; Abraham, the founder of the Jewish nation. The scene is laid partly upon earth and partly in Hades.<sup>2</sup> On earth the rich man lives in selfish luxury, doing nothing to alleviate the suffering of Lazarus who in desperate case lies at his door. In the world of departed spirits their lot is reversed, Lazarus being received into Paradise, while the rich man, excluded from the company of the blest, suffers excruciating torments. It is not as a necessary consequence of his having been rich that Dives suffers, but it is because he did not make a good use of his wealth. His efforts to get even the least relief are fruitless, because the consequences of his course of life are inevitable. In the very fact that Lazarus was received into Abraham’s bosom, *i. e.*, admitted to his intimate companionship, is the implication that his life had been a worthy one as well as one of suffering : a poor bad man would have been recognised by Jesus as fit company for Dives. The parable is elaborated with unusual fulness ; but its details, which are borrowed from common Jewish conceptions of the other world,<sup>3</sup> have no dogmatic significance.

<sup>1</sup> This is only the Latin adj. for “rich,” borrowed from the Vulgate version of the passage and converted into a proper noun.

<sup>2</sup> See § 89 (*a*), p. 184 ; Plummer’s *Luke*, 397, 398.

<sup>3</sup> A midrash on Eccles. vii., 14, declares that “Paradise and Gehenna are so situated that they look from one into the other.”



## § 131. THE PARABLE OF THE LABOURERS IN THE VINEYARD.

*Matt. xx., 1-16.*

The Revised Version rightly makes no break between the nineteenth and twentieth chapters of Matthew, since there is a close logical connection between xix., 30 and the parable immediately following.<sup>1</sup> This connection is indicated in two ways,—first, by the connecting particle “for,”<sup>2</sup> and again by the repetition of xix., 30, in xx. 16, at the close of the parable, the repeated words reiterating, something like the *q. e. d.* of a geometrical demonstration, the statement which the story was intended to illustrate: “so, *as before said*, the last shall be first and the first last.” It is the purpose of Jesus to impress upon the minds of his followers the truth that one and the same reward, namely, the eternal life, will come to all who respond to the divine call whenever it reaches their ears, and that faithfulness in effort and not the amount of accomplishment is the test of merit. The workman who entered the vineyard at the eleventh hour did less than others simply from the lack of opportunity and not from disinclination to labour. What was paid them above the eleventh of a penny<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See the closing sentence of § 128.<sup>2</sup> γάρ.

<sup>3</sup> “Penny” at present but imperfectly represents the Gr. δηνάριον (*dēnariōn* = Lat. *denarius*) especially when it is spoken of as the payment for a day’s wages. “Shilling” would come nearer to being an adequate rendering of the word. In fifteen of the United States the shilling is of the exact value of the denarius, *i. e.*, 16 $\frac{2}{3}$  cents or about 8 $\frac{1}{2}$  pence sterling. In the absence of any exact English equivalent of δηνάριον some translators have adopted the newly coined word “denary.” There was an early English silver penny of about the value of the denarius, and this, in the sixteenth century, represented the legal wage of certain classes of day-labourers. In the time of Tiberius this was the daily pay of a Roman soldier (Tacitus, *Annals*, i., 17). Cp. Tob. v., 15 (14). In 1314 the pay of a chaplain to the Scotch bishops was a penny and a half a day.

was not in the nature of a *quid pro quo*, but was a free gift out of the good-will of the employer. The second question in verse 15 may be thus paraphrased: "Are you jealous because I am liberal to another?"

### § 132. THIRD PREDICTION OF DEATH AND RESURRECTION.

*Matt. xx., 17-19; Mark x., 32-34, Luke xviii., 31-34.*

Previous announcements by Jesus of the fate which awaits him<sup>1</sup> have been somewhat less explicit than that here recorded. The particulars here added are chiefly the declaration that he will be *delivered up unto the Gentiles* and that what is to happen will be in accordance with prophecy,—the latter statement being found only in Luke. Luke repeats with little variation what he had said in ix., 45, about the disciples not understanding the words of Jesus.<sup>2</sup>

### § 133. THE SONS OF ZEBEDEE.

*Matt. xx., 20-28; Mark x., 35-45; Luke xii., 49, 50, xxii., 24-27.*

That at this particular time, as Jesus and his disciples draw near to Jerusalem, James and John should ask to be assigned to the chief posts of honour<sup>3</sup> near their master in his coming kingdom indicates in the first place that they had not yet comprehended either the spiritual nature of his mission or his predictions of approaching death, and next that there was selfish greed and not a spirit of brotherhood among the twelve. In Matthew's account the two brothers are

<sup>1</sup> Cp. §§ 110, 114.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. § 110 (a), p. 216.

<sup>3</sup> The two posts of highest honour were on the right hand and the left of the sovereign. See Josephus, *Ant.*, vi., 11, 9.

accompanied by their mother, and it is she who makes the request in their behalf. Instead of directly reproving them for their unseemly self-seeking, as he might have done, he remarks, as if in pity for their spiritual blindness, that they do not at all realise what they are asking for, and he seeks to awaken in them a realisation of this by inquiring whether they are prepared to share with him, not his triumphs but his sufferings. No more appreciating the full import of his question than of his previous forecast of his tragic fate, they confidently declare that they are ready for anything. The "cup" is often employed in the Scriptures to symbolise one's lot in life,<sup>1</sup> the connection indicating whether the word is used in a neutral sense or whether it is typical of good or evil fortune. "Baptism" has here no reference to the religious rite, the word being symbolic only of threatening danger.<sup>2</sup> The meaning of the words in Luke which precede the reference to the baptism of suffering to which Jesus was looking forward is in part obscure. The first clause, interpreted in the light of what follows (verses 51-53), plainly refers to the commotion caused by the preaching of Jesus, which, using a Hebrew idiom, he speaks of as though purposed by him. The second clause may be understood as a willing acceptance of the situation notwithstanding the conviction that it was to issue in the sacrifice of his life. The last clause of verse 50 expresses a wish that the fearful ordeal were already past. To the two brothers Jesus declares that, while they will indeed share his fate, their rank in the kingdom will depend upon the degree of their acceptance with the Heavenly Father. Then,<sup>3</sup> calling to him the rest of the twelve, he

<sup>1</sup> See Ps. xvi., 5, xxiii., 5, cxvi., 13; Is. li., 17, 22; Jer. xlix., 12; Matt. xxvi., 42, T. R.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. 2 Sam. xxii., 4, 5, 17; Ps. xxxii., 6, xlii., 7, lxix., 1, 2, 14, 15, cxxiv., 4, 5, cxliv., 7; Is. xliii., 2.

<sup>3</sup> The connection in Luke is different, these words being there reported as having been uttered at the time of the Passover meal.

endeavours to impress upon the minds of all that they are to seek not rule but service ; and he emphasises this precept by calling their attention to the fact that his life has been and is to be to the end one of self-sacrifice for the good of the world.<sup>1</sup>

### § 134. JESUS AGAIN CURES BLINDNESS.<sup>2</sup>

*Matt. ix., 27-31, xx., 29-34 ; Mark x., 46-52 ; Luke xviii., 35-43.*

Mark and Luke agree in reporting that Jesus when in the neighbourhood of Jericho cured a certain blind man, whom the former calls Bartimæus, that is, "son of Timæus." That the tradition was somewhat confused appears from the fact that Matthew in the same connection speaks of two blind men instead of one. Moreover, while Luke places the event at the time of the entry into Jericho, Matthew and Mark say that it happened as Jesus was leaving the city.<sup>3</sup> Upon two points all agree, that Jesus was appealed to for help as being "the son of David," that is, the expected Messiah, and that the desired relief was given. Matthew alone mentions the touching of the eyes ; Mark and Luke connect the cure with the words uttered by Jesus. The paragraph from Matthew's ninth chapter belongs here only on the supposition that two

<sup>1</sup> That the word "many" at the end of the section does not necessarily limit the benefits of this sacrifice may be inferred from Rom. v., where "many" in verse 15 and "all" in verse 12 have the same application.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. § 109, p. 213.

<sup>3</sup> The best critics make no effort to remove this discrepancy, acknowledging, with Edersheim, that "it is better to admit our inability to conciliate these different notes of time than to make clumsy attempts at harmonising them." In the same spirit Alford says that "the only fair account of such differences is, that they existed in the sources from which the evangelist took his narrative."

accounts of one and the same event have found their way into the Gospel,—a supposition resting upon the agreement of the two narratives in all essential points excepting that of place (*a*).

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 248) In some Oriental countries diseases of the eyes are especially frequent.\* To persons thus afflicted the Greeks applied the word here found, *tuphlōs*,† which, according to its derivation, points only to obscurity of vision and not to a complete loss of sight. In the present narrative, no special symptoms being mentioned, it is impossible to tell what was the extent of the disability which Jesus is said to have relieved. What Professor George P. Fisher says,‡ when speaking of a similar ecclesiastical miracle, is applicable here: "Oculists know well that cases of total or partial blindness are sometimes instantly relieved. What was the special cause of the disorder in this instance? Had there been symptoms of amendment before? Was the cure complete at the moment? As long as we are unable to answer these and like questions, it is unwise to assume that there was a miracle."

## § 135. ZACCHÆUS.

*Luke xix., 1-10.*

That Zacchæus was a Jew is evidenced by his name.<sup>1</sup> Jesus declares (verse 9) that this *chief-publican*,<sup>2</sup> despite his hated calling, has not forfeited his birthright, but is *also*, *i. e.*, as well as others, a *son of Abraham*. The murmuring of the

\* See McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopædia*, i., 833. † τυφλός.

‡ *Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, 297.

<sup>1</sup> See Ezra ii., 9; Neh. vii., 14. The signification of the word is "pure."

<sup>2</sup> This is the first instance in all Gr. literature of the occurrence of the word ἀρχιτελωνης (*architelōnēs*). The exact functions of the official thus named can only be conjectured. On the simple τελώνης see p. 53, Note <sup>3</sup>.

people when Jesus made himself the guest of Zacchæus was due simply to the fact that the man's occupation made him a "sinner" in the eyes of all patriotic Jews.<sup>1</sup> It is difficult to suppose that Zacchæus meant to say (verse 8) that he had been in the habit of sharing his entire wealth with the poor and that whenever he had defrauded anyone he was accustomed to make fourfold restitution. The view is preferable which assigns to the verb<sup>2</sup> a strictly present meaning, as though he had said, "I now dedicate the half of my property to charitable uses, and to those whom I have defrauded I am resolved to return fourfold." That he was conscious of not having always acted justly is implied in his use of the indicative mood<sup>3</sup> in the conditional clause.

### § 136. ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.

*Matt. xxxi., 1-11; Mark xi., 1-11; Luke xix., 28-44.*

The caravan with which Jesus and his disciples have been travelling from Jericho toward Jerusalem has now reached the neighbourhood of the city, approaching it on the east from the height called Olivet, or the Mount of Olives.<sup>4</sup> Everything which takes place at this point seems to indicate a determination on the part of Jesus to place no further check upon the mistaken enthusiasm of his followers, but to allow them to proclaim him as the coming Messiah, even though this should hasten, as he knows it must, the fate which he has almost courted by coming hither. That his entry into the city may have more of dignity he sends two of his disciples to procure an animal on which he may ride instead of

<sup>1</sup> See § 26, comment and notes.

<sup>2</sup> δίδωμι (*didōmi*) = "I give."

<sup>3</sup> ἐσυνοπάντησα (*ēsukōphantēsa*). The verb, found in the N. T. only here and in Luke iii., 14, is of uncertain derivation.

<sup>4</sup> The accentuation of Tisch. (not of Westcott and Hort) requires the rendering "Olivet" in Luke.

walking undistinguished in the crowd. Yet it is not a war-horse which he will have, such as would fitly carry a conquering king, but only one of those patient beasts which everywhere in Oriental countries render such useful everyday service to men engaged in the arts of peace, and upon which in those days a civil magistrate might ride. The ass sent for was to be one never yet sat upon by any man; for the Jews, like others, especially valued the first use of anything.<sup>1</sup> Matthew, whether upon historical evidence, or supposing that the foal could not have been separated from its mother, or simply misunderstanding the Old Testament passage (Zech. ix., 9) which he supposes to refer to this event,<sup>2</sup> represents Jesus as sending for them both. The owner or whoever was in charge of the animals was someone who needed no other warrant for delivering them up than the assurance that "the Master" needed them. Here seems to be a hint of some previous arrangement or of knowledge on the part of Jesus that he had in this man a friend always ready and able to do for him such a service. All the evangelists<sup>3</sup> agree in making the multitudes proclaim Jesus as the Messiah, the words which the four have for the most part in common being taken from Ps. cxviii., 25, 26. "Hosanna," *i. e.*, "save now," or "save, we beseech," is virtually a prayer for the protection of the coming king, like the English "God save the king."<sup>4</sup> The words which Luke has in place of Hosanna may have been intended to represent

<sup>1</sup> Cp. 1 Sam. vi., 7.

<sup>2</sup> The prophet intends to speak of but one animal, the double mention being in accordance with the usual form of poetic parallelism. Cp. Ps. viii., 4 = Heb. ii., 6. The passage as a whole has reference to an event related to the time of the prophet and is in no proper sense predictive of the manner of the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem. See Toy, 50, 51.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. John xii., 13.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, ch. x.: "Hosanna to the God of David." See Toy, 52.

that Jewish phrase. Luke's 39th and 40th verses, which have no parallel, again show us that Jesus looked upon the present demonstration by his followers as inevitable—something not to be checked. The last clause sounds like a proverbial expression.<sup>1</sup> In the lamentation over Jerusalem, where Luke is still unsupported by the other evangelists, there is a clear prediction of the approaching destruction of the city by the Romans—a catastrophe brought upon the Jews by their own blindness.

### § 137. THE FIG-TREE WITHOUT FRUIT.

*Matt. xxi., 18, 19; Mark xi., 12-14.*

Returning into the city from Bethany, where he had lodged, Jesus is disappointed at not finding figs on a fig-tree standing at some distance from the road. This disappointment seems difficult to account for, if, as Mark says, *it was not the season of figs*, until we remember that there are early as well as late figs, and consequently that some may be quite ripe before the time for the full crop.<sup>2</sup> Wherever there are leaves upon a fig-tree there may be fruit, since this always appears before the leaves. The word in Mark translated *haply*<sup>3</sup> really serves to draw an inference and is equivalent to "therefore," "consequently." Jesus saw leaves upon the tree and *therefore* thought that there might be fruit upon it. But, this stumbling-block removed, two others remain,—the moral difficulty connected with the cursing of the tree for not having fruit upon it, and the physical difficulty involved in the immediate<sup>4</sup> withering of the tree at the word

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Heb. ii., 11.

<sup>2</sup> The author has eaten fresh ripe figs in southern Europe when the fig-orchards showed only immature fruit no larger than a hazelnut.

<sup>3</sup> ἄρα, *ara*.

<sup>4</sup> According to Mark the withering was not observed until the next morning. See xi., 20.



of Jesus. The former may be removed by supposing that what was really a parable, in which the Jewish people were likened to a tree bearing no fruit but only leaves, came in course of time to be thought of as historical narrative. With this supposition the remaining difficulty also disappears.<sup>1</sup>

### § 138. WARNING EXAMPLES.

*Luke xiii., 1-5.*

Although Luke does not connect this and the following section with his account of the coming of Jesus to Jerusalem, yet here seems to be their proper place, the former making a suitable introduction to the latter and both fitting best into the narrative at this point. The two incidents from which Jesus draws a lesson of warning are known to history only through their present mention. The people of Galilee were of a notoriously turbulent disposition, and it is probable that some disorder in the outer court of the temple, for which Galilean worshippers were, or were supposed to be, responsible, had been violently suppressed by Herod's soldiers, not without some loss of life to the disturbers of the peace. Rejecting the idea that these men, as well as those who suffered in the accident at Siloam, were only receiving the merited reward of special wickedness, Jesus declares that the entire unrepentant population of Jerusalem is threatened with a like fate.

### § 139. FIRST PARABLE OF THE FIG-TREE.

*Luke xiii., 6-9.*

The tree represents the people of Israel<sup>2</sup>; the vineyard, as in the parable of § 131, is God's kingdom. The three years

<sup>1</sup> For another view of the incident see § 142, p. 255.

<sup>2</sup> See Joel i., 7.

during which the owner looked for fruit upon the tree typify in a general way, without reference to special periods, the history of the Jewish people. A fig-tree which should bear no fruit for three consecutive years would come to be looked upon as worthless ; so the Jewish nation, having for long ages shown itself incapable of producing the fruits of righteousness, could no longer expect a continuance of the Divine favour. The vine-dresser who pleads for a little longer time in which to nurture the unpromising tree is Jesus, who has undertaken the reformation of his countrymen ; and when the vine-dresser declares that, if his efforts on behalf of the fig-tree shall prove fruitless, another year he will not say a word against its destruction, he represents the conviction of Jesus that, unless there is a speedy reformation of his countrymen, the Divine judgment upon them will not much longer be delayed.

§ 140. THE PURIFICATION OF THE TEMPLE.<sup>1</sup>

*Matt. xxi., 12, 13 ; Mark xi., 15-17 ; Luke xix., 45, 46.*

Matthew assigns this event to the day of the entry into the city, Mark to the following day. Luke has here no definite note of time. The place is that part of the temple called the Court of the Gentiles, where animals for the sacrifices were offered for sale and where money could be changed. This latter brokerage was necessary not only for the ordinary purposes of traffic but also for the supplying of Jewish money to those from abroad who had to pay the temple-tax, since no Gentile coin was allowed to go into the treasury of the Lord. In justification of his summary proceeding in expelling the traders from the sacred precincts Jesus quotes the

<sup>1</sup> The Fourth Gospel (ii., 14-16) describes a similar purification of the temple by Jesus at a much earlier date, perhaps misplacing the occurrence,

passage of Scripture <sup>1</sup> which declares that the house of God shall be called, *i. e.*, shall be, a house of prayer, blending with the quotation a declaration, based upon another passage,<sup>2</sup> that the traffickers have turned it into a robbers' cave. Mark adds that Jesus would not allow the temple-grounds to be made a thoroughfare by burden-bearers who were there on no errand connected with the offices of religion.

### § 141. HOSTILITY OF THE JEWISH LEADERS.

*Matt. xvi., 14-17; Mark xi., 18, 19; Luke xix., 47, 48.*

To the chief-priests <sup>3</sup> and the scribes, whom Matthew and Mark mention as being especially hostile to Jesus, Luke adds *the principal men of the people*,<sup>4</sup> by which would seem to be meant prominent citizens not belonging to the Sanhedrin. Matthew makes them to have been offended at the course of Jesus in performing cures in the temple and at the shouts of the children then proclaiming him as the Messiah. Their question "Do you hear what these say?" is an appeal to him to check these demonstrations. Jesus makes no other reply than to refer his questioners to an appropriate passage of Scripture.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Is. lvi., 7. The clause "for all nations" Matthew and Luke omit, thus restricting the quotation to those words which alone suited the purpose for which the passage was introduced.

<sup>2</sup> Jer. vii., 11.

<sup>3</sup> As there could be but one chief-priest at a time, some who had formerly held this office and probably others belonging to high-priestly families are here included in the class of "chief-priests."

<sup>4</sup> By λαός (*laös*), "people," here twice used by Luke, is not indicated the commonalty in distinction from the upper classes, but the mass of the citizens without respect to rank. Mark, however, uses ὄχλος (*öchlös*), "multitude,"—a more democratic term—when he speaks of the popularity of the teaching of Jesus. Cp. Luke vii., 29.

<sup>5</sup> Ps. viii., 3 (2). The quotation is in the exact form of the LXX., which uses "praise" where "strength" would be the better word.

## § 142. SEQUEL TO THE STORY OF THE FIG-TREE WITHOUT FRUIT.

*Matt. xxi., 20-22 ; Mark xi., 20-26.*

Matthew and Mark both associate with the withering of the fig-tree (*a*) certain sayings of Jesus with regard to faith and prayer, some of which are found substantially elsewhere in better connections.<sup>1</sup> That some of these sayings have been misunderstood by the evangelists can hardly be doubted. Even if Jesus, when he spoke of removing mountains, pointed to the Mount of Olives or to one of the hills on which the city stood, this striking gesture must be understood as intended only to add emphasis to his assertion of the wonderful power which comes from the possession of faith.

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 255) If the withering of the fig-tree is to be considered an historical incident first observed by the disciples at the time here mentioned by Mark, the interval of a day may have been sufficient for the production of this effect by natural causes. Whatever the facts may have been, the evangelists intend to describe an act of thaumaturgy, and they even represent Jesus himself as speaking in accordance with this conception. Granting that the narrative had some historical foundation, and is not simply a transformed parable, it may be assumed that the facts were misunderstood and so perverted in transmission.

## § 143. A QUESTION OF AUTHORITY.

*Matt. xxi., 23-27 ; Mark xi., 27-33 ; Luke xx., 1-8.*

When the priests and scribes and elders asked Jesus "by what sort of authority" he was acting, they did not question the rightfulness of the expulsion of the hucksters from the

<sup>1</sup> See Matt. vi., 14, 15, xvii., 20. Cp. § 113.

temple-court, but only suggested a doubt as to whether this was a work which one in the position of Jesus, without official authority, had any right to undertake. It did not occur to them that he might have within himself an authority higher than any of which they had knowledge. By virtue of their position as the recognised religious leaders of the people they assumed to call him to account for infringing upon their privileges. A direct answer that he was acting by authority derived from God would have been likely to result only in another demand for a sign from heaven. But they could not deny, without risking the loss of their reputation and consequent influence with the people, that John the Baptist had had a divine mission ; and if they could be brought to acknowledge this, there was a possibility of their seeing that he might be doing a work of the same kind : hence his question to them about John, the answering of which he makes the condition of his replying to their question.

§ 144. RESULTS OF THE PREACHING OF THE  
BAPTIST, TOGETHER WITH THE PARABLE  
OF THE TWO UNLIKE SONS.

*Matt. xxi., 28-32 ; Luke vii., 29, 30.*

In the parable the son who repented of his refusal to obey his father represents the reformed evil-doer, while he who promised readily, but broke his promise, typifies those who pretend to a righteousness which they do not possess. By giving the only possible answer to the question, " Which one of the two did his father's will ? " those who had just been calling Jesus to account condemned themselves ; but, that they may not miss the point of the parable, he adds an " improvement " in terms too plain to be misunderstood, declaring in substance that their self-righteousness is a greater bar to

their entrance into the kingdom than the vices of those whom they look down upon. Such were slaves only of passion, which they might learn to control, and not of an overmastering selfishness. These added words Luke introduces much earlier, in connection with what Jesus says to the multitude concerning John. In Luke it is indicated that those who received baptism at the hands of John thereby recognised his mission as divine ; in Matthew it is declared, from another point of view, that John was a righteous man. When Luke says that the "lawyers" were among those who rejected the teaching of John, a word is used of which he has almost a monopoly among the evangelists, Mark and John not using it at all and Matthew having it only once ; but Luke also frequently makes use of the synonymous word "scribe."<sup>1</sup>

#### § 145. THE PARABLE OF THE PRODIGAL SON.

*Luke xv., 11-32.*

Although the parables of the lost sheep and the lost drachma in Luke xv., 1-10 (see § 119) immediately precede this and seem closely related to it, they are less comprehensive in their teaching. While the prodigal corresponds to the lost sheep and the lost coin, and his older brother may be included in the "ninety and nine righteous persons which need no repentance," the parable of this section is far richer in its teaching, and emphasises what in the two earlier ones was left quite in the background. The older son represents the scribes and Pharisees, whose service to God consisted in keeping the letter of the law (*a*). Jesus would teach the self-righteous that God loves every child of His, and that, however much one may have strayed from the path of virtue, He longs to welcome home the erring one. All the details of the parable are in harmony with the conditions of Oriental life.

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix D.

## NOTE.

(a, p. 257) That interpretation which has had its defenders from Augustine down to our own day, according to which the older son represents the Jews and the younger the Gentiles, so far from receiving any justification from the context does positive violence to the connection of thought.

§ 146. THE PARABLE OF THE PHARISEE AND THE TAX-GATHERER.

*Luke xviii., 9-14.*

The introductory and closing sentences of the section make known the intent of the parable and show its fitness to be looked upon as a pendant to the story of the prodigal son. The Pharisee is brought forward as the type of those who have such a lofty opinion of their own virtue that in their estimation the virtue of no one else is worth mentioning ; while the tax-gatherer stands for those who recognise and make humble confession of their shortcomings. At the usual hour of prayer all sorts and conditions of men would meet at the temple. Although the Pharisee is said to have *prayed*,<sup>1</sup> his words are those neither of petition nor of thanksgiving to God for blessings received, but merely of self-gratulation because of his freedom from the vices of which everybody else is supposed to be guilty, and of boasting concerning his frequent fasting and his bountiful almsgiving ; for he tithes not only the prescribed products of the field but his entire income, and he fasts not only once a year, as prescribed by the law, but twice every week. The tax-gatherer, standing at a distance, upon whom the Pharisee has turned a scornful eye even in the midst of his so-called prayer, speaks of himself in a spirit of contrition as *the*<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The words " by himself " are not certainly genuine. They are omitted by Tischendorf.

<sup>2</sup> The R. V. has no warrant for using the indefinite article.

*sinner*, not with mock-humility, as though he would put himself below everyone else, but simply recognising absolutely and without comparison with others his own sinfulness.

## § 147. THE PARABLE OF THE FAITHLESS VINE-DRESSERS.

*Matt. xxi., 33-46 ; Mark xii., 1-12 ; Luke xx., 9-19.*

Whether this parable was spoken directly to the representatives of the Sanhedrin (as Mark says and Matthew implies) or to the people (as Luke states) is immaterial, since in either case the application of it is the same. Those who claimed to be the rightful teachers of the people had, whether honestly or not, confessed their ignorance with regard to the nature of John's mission, thus proving themselves incompetent moral and spiritual guides. In the parable these self-condemned teachers are also charged with being faithless to their trust. Like vine-dressers who fraudulently hold back from their master his share of the products of the vineyard which has been intrusted to their care, they have so perverted the truth as to make their ministry to God's people fruitless and worse than fruitless. The consequence of their misdoing will be the giving of their office to teachers who will render faithful service. These untrustworthy leaders of the people are not, however, everywhere and in all three of the reports, distinctly separated from the people as a whole. It was the Jewish nation and not merely its rulers who were guilty of the blood of the prophets, God's *servants*<sup>1</sup>; and in Matthew it is another and a worthier *nation*<sup>2</sup> to which the kingdom of God is to be given. By this "nation" is meant, not any favoured race, but the faithful servants of God everywhere. The vineyard being God's

<sup>1</sup> δοῦλοι.

<sup>2</sup> ἔθνος.



kingdom, His son whom He sends as His last messenger is Jesus, through whose death the national hierarchy hopes to strengthen its power and influence beyond the possibility of overthrow. Jesus supplements the parable with a quotation from Scripture<sup>1</sup> in which Israel despised by the nations is promised a glorious future. He so uses the passage as to suggest that the new doctrine of the kingdom, rejected by the religious leaders of the people, is yet to triumph over their opposition. In language which recalls Is. viii., 14, and Dan. ii., 34, 35, 44, Luke's 18th verse<sup>2</sup> emphasises the fatal results of hostility to the truth.

### § 148. ADVICE TO GUESTS AND HOST.

*Luke xiv., 7-14.*

Although the first part of this section is spoken of by the evangelist as a *parable*, in its form it is directly hortatory rather than parabolic; nevertheless the fact that it is called a parable, together with the presence of a "moral" in verse 11, shows that its main purpose is conceived to have been not the regulation of certain forms of social intercourse but the inculcation of modesty of bearing under all circumstances. It is probable that the passage is to be referred to Prov. xxv., 6, 7, as its ultimate source. The second paragraph is as much a parable as the first, although not so styled. Its lesson is one of unselfishness and benevolence in action. To him who strives to give satisfaction to others rather than to secure the gratification of his own inclinations is promised a due reward *in the resurrection of the just*.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ps. cxviii., 22, 23. Luke has only verse 22, which is also used by Peter in 1 Pet. ii., 7, and Acts iv., 11. See Toy, 56-58.

<sup>2</sup> Of very doubtful genuineness in Matt. and altogether wanting in Mark.

<sup>3</sup> In precisely what form Jesus held the doctrine of the resurrection it is not easy to determine, so seldom in the Synoptic Gospels does

§ 149. THE PARABLE OF THE GREAT FEAST.

*Matt. xxii., 1-14; Luke xiv., 15-24.*

It must be granted that there is a possibility of recognising here two distinct parables; yet the differences between Matthew and Luke are not such as to indicate a difference of purpose. Luke has a good connection with what goes before. Someone of the guests at table with Jesus catches up what he has just said about the blessedness awaiting the just at the time of the resurrection and piously exclaims that he will be blessed who shall share in the great Messianic feast.<sup>1</sup> In the parable Jesus gives him to understand that he is mistaken if he supposes, as he seems to do, that he and others like him are to be among the fortunate ones, without regard to the way in which they have treated the gospel invitation. The *many* invited to the feast are the Jewish people, to whom the message of the coming of the kingdom of God had been delivered through a succession of heralds from the first of the ancient prophets down to John and Jesus. The rejection of this message by the theocratic rulers of the Jewish people acting as representatives of the nation is typified by the unreadiness of the invited guests when informed that the time for the banquet has arrived. The excuses given represent the various worldly interests which excluded from the mind all care for nobler things. Those called to take the places of the guests originally invited are first the despised portion of the Jewish people, such as "tax-gatherers and sinners," and, next, those quite outside the fold—the Gentiles. The principal point of difference between Matthew and Luke, apart from the different connection in

he refer to this subject. Besides the present passage, in Luke xx., 35, 36, he speaks of a resurrection of the just. Cp. Acts xxiv., 15.

<sup>1</sup> For the common Jewish conception of the Messianic kingdom as a period of festivity, see Is. xxv., 6.

which they introduce the parable, is that in Matthew, after the final refusal of the invited guests to come to the banquet, there are not two separate invitations sent out to others, but only one. That Matthew makes the host a *king*, while Luke speaks only of a *certain man*, is an unimportant variation. There is, however, an important additional paragraph in Matthew, in which the host is represented as excluding from the banqueting-hall a man who had come in without having on a suitable garment. In its application there is the teaching that although all men are invited to the heavenly feast, only those will be received who comply with the conditions of the invitation. The colouring of the picture is heightened by contrasting the brilliancy of the banqueting-hall with the darkness outside—*the outer darkness*, where the rejected guest gives vent to his feelings in expressions of mortification and rage.

#### § 150. A QUESTION ABOUT PAYING TRIBUTE TO CÆSAR.

*Matt. xxii., 15-22 ; Mark xii., 13-17 ; Luke xx., 20-26.*

Once again<sup>1</sup> the Herodians form an alliance with the Pharisees for the purpose of endeavouring to entrap Jesus. The plot is skilfully contrived, but it utterly fails from the plotters not understanding his real thought and purpose. Recent events seemed to indicate that he had Messianic pretensions ; and for one who would be king of Israel to counsel the payment of tribute to the very power which he was aiming to overthrow would be to lose the sympathy of those masses of the common people who had shown themselves eager to support his supposed royal claim. On the other hand, should he side with the zealots and counsel resistance to the demands of Rome, he would lay himself open to the

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Mark iii., 6.

charge of encouraging sedition. Instead of trying to steer between Scylla and Charybdis, as they supposed that he must, with the sure prospect of shipwreck, he turns the prow of his vessel toward the safe open sea. The use of Roman money by Jews was a recognition of Roman authority. As their great legal authority Maimonides expressed it later, "Wherever the money of any king circulates, there the inhabitants recognise that king as their master." Jesus virtually says, "You have already answered your own question by using this money and thus placing yourselves under obligation to Cæsar: what you have forgotten is that you also have obligations to God—obligations to be met in quite another way."

#### § 151. A QUESTION ABOUT THE RESURRECTION.

*Matt. xxii., 23-33; Mark xii., 18-27; Luke xx., 27-38.*

In Mark it is said of the Sadducees as a class that they disbelieved in the doctrine of the resurrection; but Luke seems to recognise a difference of opinion among them, and Matthew may be understood as saying only that those here spoken of gave expression at this time to their scepticism. A striking case under the levirate law of Deut. xxv., 5, 6, is brought forward, as though the confusion which might be supposed to result in the next world from such plural marriages in this life was evidence that the lawgiver supposed that death ended all. This objection Jesus answers by saying that in the world to come there will be no marriage. According to Luke he adds that after the resurrection there will be no more death, thereby suggesting that there will be no more need of births to save the race from extinction. But, not satisfied with removing the difficulty which had been a stumbling-block to his questioners, Jesus offers to them an argument drawn from the Scriptures in support of the general

doctrine of a resurrection. It is urged that, since it is said in Ex. iii., 6, that God *is* the God of the patriarchs, they must be still alive, since he cannot be the God of dead men. The real meaning of the passage is that Jehovah is the God whom the patriarchs worshipped.

## § 152. THE GREAT COMMANDMENT.

*Matt. xxii., 34-40 ; Mark xii., 28-34 ; Luke xx., 39, 40, x., 25-28.*

The question "What is the great commandment?" was often discussed by the rabbis. In Luke the query is propounded to Jesus in the earlier part of his ministry and in a different form, but that the essential purport is the same as in Matthew and Mark is evidenced by the context. Matthew and Luke represent the lawyer<sup>1</sup> who came to Jesus with this question as desirous of "testing" him; but in this there may have been nothing malevolent. Mark represents him as having the spirit of a genuine truth-seeker and as being most heartily commended by Jesus for his wise words. In Luke, indeed, the lawyer is made virtually to answer his own question, since it is he and not Jesus who quotes the words of the law.<sup>2</sup> The concluding words of the section in Mark and Luke indicate that Jesus had now gained a reputation for skilful dialectics which henceforth deterred cavillers from trying to puzzle him with difficult problems. Matthew has the same statement in verse 46 in a more suitable connection.

<sup>1</sup> See § 144, p. 257.

<sup>2</sup> Deut. vi., 5; Lev. xix., 18. The preceding verse in Deut. is found only in Mark. See R. V. margin; Toy, 60, 61.

§ 153. THE STORY OF THE GOOD SAMARITAN.

*Luke x., 29-37.*

According to Luke, the lawyer, realising that he must appear to be in the position of one who has foolishly asked a question of which he already knows the answer, tries to save his reputation for shrewdness by representing that the real point of difficulty is to determine who is one's neighbour. Jesus replies with what has usually been taken to be a parable, but which may perhaps be true history,—for the steep road, some twenty miles in length and with an average descent of about one hundred and fifty feet to the mile, which leads down from the heights on which Jerusalem stands to Jericho in the plain near the Jordan, was, in the time of Jesus as it is now, infested with robbers. By the story Jesus would teach that the relation of neighbourliness is established by the giving and receiving of needed help and is not dependent either upon proximity of dwelling or upon descent from a common stock. This was to give to the word "neighbour" an unheard-of extent of application, since no Gentile had ever been thought of as possibly becoming "neighbour" to a Jew, except by renunciation of his heathen faith.

§ 154. THE QUESTION, "WHAT THINK YE ABOUT THE CHRIST?"

*Matt. xxii., 41-46; Mark xii., 35-37; Luke xx., 41-44.*

According to Matthew Jesus asks the Pharisees whose descendant the Messiah is to be, and receives the only reply which any Jew of that period could give, that the Christ will be of the lineage of David. In Mark and Luke the general acceptance of this opinion is assumed. Then follows the

searching question, "How could David, in the Psalms<sup>1</sup> speak of one of his own descendants as lord?" It would seem to have been the purpose of Jesus by this question to set people to thinking whether their conception of the Messiah was the true one and whether the Christ was to be a king sprung from Davidic stock. There is an implied argument of this sort: "No man would speak of a son of his as his lord; David does speak of the Messiah as his lord; therefore he did not think of him as his son." If the false conception of the Messiah as a Davidic king could be removed, there was a possibility that the true spiritual Messiahship of Jesus might be recognised (*a*).

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 266) The fact that modern scholarship affirms the non-Davidic authorship of Ps. cx. makes it necessary to hold, in opposition to the prevailing theory of the Christian Church, that Jesus had no other standard of judgment with regard to the Old Testament Scriptures than the current opinion of his time. Having been taught from his childhood up that all the Psalms were written by David, there is no reason to suppose that any doubt upon this point ever presented itself to his mind. It cannot properly be claimed that he merely used the name "David" as a synonyme for "the Psalms," just as "Homer" and "Shakespeare" often stand for certain literary compositions the authorship of which has been disputed, and as sometimes in the New Testament "Moses" may perhaps stand for the books ascribed to Moses; for the whole force of the passage as here quoted depends upon the recognition of David as its author. Again, Jesus shares the opinion of his contemporaries that Ps. cx. is of a Messianic character,—a view receiving no support from modern Biblical criticism.\*

<sup>1</sup> Ps. cx., i.

\* On this point see Toy, 61-64; Briggs's *The Messiah of the Gospels*, 118, 119; Gould's *Mark*, 234-236.

## § 155. DENUNCIATION OF PHARISAISM.

*Matt. xxiii., 1-36; Mark xii., 38-40; Luke xi., 37-52, xx., 45-47.*

In this section are brought together various utterances of Jesus condemnatory of the scribes and Pharisees.<sup>1</sup> Luke makes the occasion of some of these sayings to have been an invitation to Jesus from a certain Pharisee to breakfast with him. This was not at Jerusalem but somewhere upon the route of the previous journeyings. When Jesus disregarded the usual Pharisaic custom of washing the hands before partaking of food, his host was struck with astonishment. Jesus replied either to his looks or to his expressions of surprise in words which Matthew makes a part of the last discourse *to the multitudes and to his disciples*. Yet, even according to Luke, some of the warnings against the scribes were spoken in Jerusalem and *in the hearing of all the people*. The little which Mark has is ascribed to the Jerusalem period. In saying that the scribes and Pharisees sit in the seat of Moses Jesus uses language based upon the custom of the rabbis to sit while teaching.<sup>2</sup> He finds no fault with the character of the instruction given by the authorised teachers of the people, but only blames them for the inconsistency of their lives. They are the successors of the great Jewish lawgiver and are to be looked upon as the legitimate expounders of his precepts. In speaking of the demands made by them upon others under the figure of heavy burdens placed upon the shoulders of the people, he calls up to the imagination pictures of every-day Oriental life, in which we see men and women staggering under immense loads of bundled faggots or ma-

<sup>1</sup> Whether the consecutive arrangement of Matthew is historically preferable to Luke's wider distribution and different collocation of matter it does not seem possible to determine.

<sup>2</sup> So we speak of occupying a chair of instruction. Cp. the introduction to the Sermon on the Mount, § 34, p. 95.



terials for building. In charging them with an inordinate love of display he particularises first, according to Matthew, their fondness for the wearing of striking fringes or tassels upon the hems of their garments and of pious charms covered with portions of Scripture upon the forehead and left arm,<sup>1</sup>—a practice supposed to be enjoined in certain passages of the Mosaic law. According to all three of the Synoptics he condemns their liking for prominent positions in the synagogues and at feasts and the self-complacency with which they receive the respectful salutations of the market-place. To all this there is added in Mark and Luke the walking about in long robes or “stoles”—a garb of distinction. Matthew stands alone in recording an injunction which could have been intended only for the disciples,—that titles of honour, such as the scribes and Pharisees were fond of, should be rejected. Luke has the closing injunctions to modesty elsewhere.<sup>2</sup> Mark and Luke stand by themselves<sup>3</sup> in preserving, in almost identical language, the indictment of the scribes for the robbery of widows<sup>4</sup> and the ostentatious making of long prayers. Mark knows nothing of the so-called “seven woes” found in Matthew, while Luke has only a portion of them and that mostly in an abbreviated form. The first is a censure of the scribes and Pharisees<sup>5</sup> for locking the door to the temple of knowledge—*i. e.*, the kingdom of the heavens—

<sup>1</sup> See the *Standard Dictionary*, “Phylactery”; Thayer, *φυλακτήριον*. The word is found nowhere else in the N. T. On both “tassels” and “phylacteries” see Carpenter, *L. P.*, 127, 128.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. with Matthew’s verse 11 Luke xxii., 26; with verse 12, xiv., 11, xviii., 14.

<sup>3</sup> Matthew’s verse 14 (A. V.) is an interpolation based on Mark and Luke.

<sup>4</sup> Considering what Josephus (*Ant.*, xvii., 2, 4) and the Talmudists say about the Pharisees, it is likely that the wheedling of rich widows out of their property is here principally intended, rather than the plundering of the poor.

<sup>5</sup> In Luke “lawyers.” See § 144.

and carrying away the key. Nowhere else in the Gospels are proselytes spoken of. What Jesus here says of them is confirmed not only by early Christian testimony but by that of the Talmudists as well. The third "woe" is directed against the senseless distinctions of the rabbis in the matter of oaths. The question of the propriety of oaths in general is not here touched upon.<sup>1</sup> The fourth "woe" is pronounced not against over-scrupulousness in the observance of religious obligations, but against greater devotion to matters of little consequence than to those of the greatest importance. In tithing even the commonest herbs the Pharisees were strict beyond the requirements of the law. The figure of straining out the gnat and swallowing the camel is derived from the Pharisaic custom of straining wine before drinking it, lest by swallowing some insect drowned in it they should be rendered ceremonially impure. The Greeks and Romans often did the same thing, but not from religious scruples. Luke's parallel to Matthew's fifth "woe" varies from it somewhat in form although not greatly in meaning. In Matthew the idea is that the scribes and Pharisees, while very scrupulous about the rinsing of dishes, were far from being careful as to what they put into them, the luxuries upon which they feasted to excess being purchased with the products of extortion. If they would only reform their lives in this latter respect, they would not need to trouble themselves so much about the purification of table utensils. In Luke there is a passing from the outside of the cup and platter to the inside of the person, the latter being capable of being understood either literally or figuratively—of food obtained by extortionate and evil courses or of a dishonest disposition. The last sentence is obscure, because of the impossibility of determining what it is which is enjoined to be given in alms,—whether food from the table is to be distributed to the needy, or whether only the cherishing of a

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Matt. v., 33-37.

benevolent disposition is inculcated. In the sixth "woe" likewise Luke is not very closely parallel with Matthew, since according to him the Pharisees are compared to unseen graves over which one may stumble unawares and so become defiled,<sup>1</sup> instead of to whitewashed tombs whose outward neatness contrasts strikingly with the decay going on within. The fundamental idea of the hidden depravity of the Pharisees is, however, common to both. In the last "woe" Matthew represents the building of the tombs of the prophets as a sort of atonement for the guilt of past generations, although this very act and its professed purpose really bear witness to the descent of the tomb-builders from those who murdered the prophets. In Luke the guilt is represented as cumulative,—“In building the tombs of the prophets you complete the work which your fathers began.” This idea receives special emphasis in the concluding sentences of both Matthew and Luke. Matthew’s 32d verse has been fitly characterised as “a mournful sarcasm”; what immediately follows, notwithstanding its interrogative form, is the severest invective. This is followed in Matthew by a prediction of the fate awaiting the messengers of Christ,—a prediction which in Luke is ascribed to *the wisdom of God* (a). Of all this wickedness, added to that of past ages from the beginning of the world, the penalty is to be paid by the men of *this generation*,—a reference to the impending destruction of the Jewish state (b).

## NOTES.

(a, p. 270) The words quoted cannot be traced to their source. They have little resemblance to anything in the Old Testament, neither are the Scriptures spoken of anywhere else as “the wisdom of God.” It has been conjectured by some that Jesus is referred to under this title; by others, that the Deity himself is meant; by still others,

<sup>1</sup> “Whosoever in the open field toucheth  
unclean seven days.”—Num. xix., 16.

a grave shall be

that there was an apocryphal book thus styled, from which the quotation was taken.

(*b*, p. 270) In making the Zachariah of whose murder he speaks to have been the son of Barachiah, Matthew confuses two different persons. The event referred to is doubtless that described in 2 Chron. xxiv., 21; but the Zachariah there spoken of was the son of Jehoiada and not of Barachiah. There is no account of the son of Jehoiada having perished by violence. Moreover, as Genesis, which describes the death of Abel, was the first book of the Jewish canon, so 2 Chronicles, which contains the account of the death of Zachariah the son of Jehoiada, was the last, the former thus beginning and the latter ending the catalogue of crimes to be expiated by the Jewish people.

## § 156. LAMENTATION OVER JERUSALEM.

*Matt. xxiii., 37-39; Luke xiii., 34, 35.*

The repetition of the word *Jerusalem* is in itself an indication of tender solicitude for the welfare of the city.<sup>1</sup> By *the prophets* and *them that are sent unto her* the same persons are meant, the varying of the expression being in the spirit of Hebrew poetic parallelism. The figure of the hen gathering her brood under her wings is found in 2 Esd. i., 30,<sup>2</sup> the context of which has still further likeness to the present passage. In saying to the inhabitants of Jerusalem that their house is to be left desolate Jesus declares that the Divine protection will no longer be over them.<sup>3</sup> Him they will no longer see until they recognise him in his "coming" as the Lord's Anointed<sup>4</sup> (*a*).

### NOTE.

(*a*, p. 271) Only in Matthew has this section a suitable setting; for such words cannot be conceived of as having

<sup>1</sup> Cp. "Martha, Martha," Luke x., 41.

<sup>2</sup> Also in rabbinical literature and in Euripides.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. the whole passage 2 Esd. i., 28-33.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. Ps. cxviii., 26.

been spoken away from Jerusalem. Because the words *how often* seem to point to frequent visits to the capital, whereas the Synoptics give the impression that Jesus had never been there before since his childhood, some have doubted the authenticity of the passage.

### § 157. THE WIDOW'S MITE.

*Mark xii., 41-44 ; Luke xxi., 1-4.*

The temple-treasury here spoken of is not the place where the temple-funds were stored, but the trumpet-shaped receptacles, which, like the contribution-boxes upon the walls of some Roman Catholic churches at the present day, bore inscriptions indicating the different objects to the furthering of which the contents were to be applied.<sup>1</sup> With the many rich people who were at this time offering their contributions is contrasted the single<sup>2</sup> poor widow : all the rest were rich. Her extreme poverty is indicated by the fact that the sum which she put in was the least which it was allowable for one to offer. It is useless to speculate as to how Jesus knew that the woman contributed all the money which she then had, and that this was two mites.

### § 158. PROPHECY CONCERNING THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE.

*Matt. xxiv., 1-3 ; Mark xiii., 1-4 ; Luke xxi., 5-7.*

To the vague intimation previously given that some dire calamity threatens the people of Jerusalem is now added a specific prediction of the destruction of the temple,—an event which could hardly take place except under conditions involving the overthrow of the city by a foreign power. Shortly

<sup>1</sup> See Josephus, *Ant.*, xix., 6, 1.

<sup>2</sup> *μία*.

after the utterance of this prophecy, when Jesus and his disciples are on the Mount of Olives, from which the temple could be clearly seen, he is asked by some of them when this event will occur and what will be the indications of its approach,—although from the use of the plural, *these things*, it would appear that the penalties of the nation's misdeeds, spoken of in the last verses of § 155, were in the speaker's mind, and not merely the destruction of the temple. In Matthew "these things" are developed into "thy coming and the consummation of the age." The Greek word translated "coming" is *parousia*,<sup>1</sup> the exact signification of which is "presence," here "presence after return." "When, after your departure from us, are we to look for your return?" the disciples ask. Outside of this chapter the word *parousia* is not found in the Gospels (*a*); yet in Christian theology it has become the usual term by which to designate the expected return or "second coming" of Christ to the earth. On "the consummation of the age" see what was said in connection with § 79, pp. 165, 166.

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 273) Since the evangelists represent the disciples of Jesus as not having anticipated his death, notwithstanding his several predictions of it (see § 110 (*a*)), this question can hardly have been asked in the exact form in which Matthew gives it. The fact that the "parousia" is twenty times spoken of in the Epistles suggests the possibility of the late introduction into this passage of this particular phrase at a time when the doctrine of the second personal coming of Jesus had become fully developed. Nevertheless, through this phrase Matthew has a better connection with what follows than either Mark or Luke, with whom the subject of false Messiahs is introduced quite abruptly in the next section.

<sup>1</sup> *παρουσία*.

### § 159. FALSE MESSIAHS AND MISLEADING PORTENTS.

*Matt. xxiv., 4-8; Mark xiii., 5-9a; Luke xxi., 8-11*

Of the eschatological discourse contained in §§ 159-172 the first eight sections have been fitly styled the Synoptic Apocalypse (*a*). First there comes a warning to the disciples against being led astray by men claiming to have a divine mission to become saviours of their country. Jesus anticipates that after his death false messiahs will arise, by whom the people will be in danger of being deluded. Then again every rumour of war which should come to the ears of the disciples would be likely to recall what Jesus had said about the destruction of the city and to lead them to imagine that it was near at hand. Even startling phenomena in the natural world would be interpreted as omens of coming catastrophe.<sup>1</sup> Such things are sure to happen, says Jesus, but they will not indicate that the approaching crisis is imminent. This will be only the beginning of the pangs without which there can be no birth of "the coming age." The signs of the times, as interpreted by Jesus, pointed to the ultimate but not immediate destruction of the Jewish state.<sup>2</sup>

#### NOTE.

(*a*, p. 274) This is Holtzmann's phrase,\* by the adoption of which one does not, however, commit himself to Holtzmann's theory that the prophecies contained in these sections

<sup>1</sup> Cp. 2 Esdr. ix., 1 ff.

<sup>2</sup> To the fact of the generally disturbed condition of the Roman Empire during this period, history furnishes ample testimony. See Josephus (*Ant.*, xx., 8, 5), who says that Palestine at this time was full of disturbers of the peace, whom he characterises by a term (*γοετης*) not exactly descriptive of, but yet properly applicable to, the false messiahs here spoken of.

\*Réville styles the discourse concerning "the last things" "la petite apocalypse," though also using Holtzmann's phrase. Dr. Briggs calls it "the Apocalypse of Jesus."

were put into the mouth of Jesus after the destruction of Jerusalem and that we have here only "a stray leaf from the period of the Jewish war." It remains to be seen whether the predictions here ascribed to Jesus are so precise and circumstantial as to be attributable, in their present form, rather to a knowledge of what was already past than to a piercing of the shadows cast before them by coming events. Neither in adopting the term "apocalyptic" is there any need of recognising this portion of the Gospels as belonging to what is technically called apocalyptic literature; for most of its contents are conceived in the true spirit of prophecy and are apocalyptic only in the very general sense of disclosing what is going to happen.

### § 160. PERSECUTIONS AND APOSTASIES.

*Matt. xxiv., 9-14; Mark xiii., 9b-13; Luke xxi., 12-19.*

"But do *you* look out for *yourselves*" is the emphatic injunction through which Jesus seeks to guard his disciples against being led astray by the delusions of which he has just been speaking. In Mark and Luke there is a prediction of legal trials to which the disciples will be exposed, for which in Matthew there stands the single vague term *tribulation*.<sup>1</sup> That they will be the object of general hatred and that some will lose their lives is mentioned by all, but it is only in Matthew that a notable falling away from the faith is predicted. According to Matthew the preaching of the gospel throughout the whole Roman Empire is to precede the coming of *the end*, *i. e.*, the conclusion of the period of warning signs which is to precede the great consummation.<sup>2</sup> To those who shall have been able to endure all the trials which have thus far threatened them there will come final safety.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *θλίψις, thlipsis.*

<sup>2</sup> For testimony to the fulfilment of this prediction see Col. i., 5, 6, 23.

<sup>3</sup> In Luke *ψυχάς* is to be translated "souls," as in E. V., only if that reading is to be adopted which has the verb in the aor. imper. instead of the fut. ind., unless one thing is meant in Luke and another in Matt. and Mark.



## § 161. JERUSALEM ENCOMPASSED BY ARMIES.

*Matt. xxiv., 15-22 ; Mark xiii., 14-20 ; Luke xxi., 20-24.*

For the right understanding of the note of time and circumstance found in Matthew and Mark we have only to take Luke as our interpreter. The *abomination of desolation* is the hated presence of the Roman armies upon the soil of Palestine.<sup>1</sup> Matthew, however, looking back to the Old Testament and finding there this peculiar phrase, especially in the prophecy of Daniel,<sup>2</sup> merely makes a reference to the prophet and throws no light whatever upon the meaning of Jesus. Mark also has the phrase, but makes no reference to Daniel, so that his conception is probably the same as Luke's, although, instead of specifying Jerusalem or even using Matthew's designation of Palestine as "holy ground" (*a*), he simply locates the desolation "where it ought not to be." In Matthew *let him that readeth understand* may be spoken by Jesus, who desires to call attention to the language of the book of Daniel ; but in Mark it must be the evangelist who summons his readers to ponder well the significance of the immediately preceding words,—as though he were writing at the time when the Romans were already massing their forces in Palestine. At this time, before the attack has really begun, if the disciples regard the instructions of Jesus, those living in the country will take refuge in the mountain region across the Jordan, and those dwelling in the city will make haste to leave it.<sup>3</sup> The urgency of the situation will admit of no delay, and no time is to be wasted in preparations for departure. Fortunate will those be who under these hard conditions do not have to bear the burdens and responsibilities of motherhood. Fortunate too will it be if the time for

<sup>1</sup> Josephus, *Ant.*, xviii., 5, 3.

<sup>2</sup> See Dan. ix., 27, xi., 31, xii., 11, and cp. 1 Mac. i., 54.

<sup>3</sup> Before the siege of the city began many Christians did actually escape to the mountains of Peræa.

flight does not come in the rainy winter season,<sup>1</sup> and especially if it shall not be necessary to journey upon the sabbath day, when the religious scruples of some may stand in the way of their travelling far enough to make good their escape.<sup>2</sup> Through Divine Providence some chosen ones will be saved (so in Matthew and Mark), but the destruction of the city will be complete and most of its inhabitants will be either slaughtered or led away into captivity (Luke). What is meant by *the times of the Gentiles* in Luke's last verse is much disputed. Perhaps these two related ideas are involved in the phrase,—the period of Roman domination over the Jewish people, and the spreading of the Christian faith among the Gentiles.

## NOTE.

(a, p. 276) Matthew's mention of Daniel has set the commentators to searching for some event in the history of Jerusalem in the period immediately preceding its downfall which might be considered a fulfilment of prophecy. Especially has it been thought that by "the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place" some profanation of the temple is meant. Apart from the consideration that a prevision of such particular historical circumstance cannot with reason be ascribed to Jesus, the absence of the article before "holy" in the original leaves a reference to the temple altogether doubtful. That the word translated "place" (*tōpōs*)\* may refer not only to a particular spot or a limited space but to an entire district is made evident by John xi., 48, where the Jewish authorities declare that if they let Jesus alone there will be such a flocking of the people to him that the Romans will come and conquer the nation and take possession of their territory (*topon*).

<sup>1</sup> The miserable roads of Palestine were and are travelled with the greatest difficulty during the stormy winter months, and then the watercourses are swollen to torrents.

<sup>2</sup> It is only the Hebraistically coloured Gospel of Matthew which has the words *μηδε σαββατω*, *neither on a sabbath*. It is not unlikely that we have here an instance of the influence of a Jewish-Christian redactor.

\* *τόπος*.

## § 162. MORE FALSE MESSIAHS.

*Matt. xxiv., 23-25 ; Mark xiii., 21-23.*

The time of the advent of more claimants to Messianic dignity is the time of the events of the preceding section. The warning of Jesus is against the accepting of any one as God's appointed saviour of the Jewish people from the power of Rome. He looks for the appearing of religious and political enthusiasts, some of whom may even be able to perform wonderful deeds which will so impress the people as to lead them to believe that their deliverer has at last really come. He sees that these delusions will only add to the miseries attending the downfall of the Jewish state. But *the elect*,<sup>1</sup> those whom it is the purpose of God to have saved, will not be thus deceived.

## § 163. MANNER OF THE COMING OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE SON OF MAN.

*Matt. xxiv., 26, 27 ; Luke xvii., 20-25.*

In Matthew Jesus continues to speak of the coming of the "Son of Man," while in Luke, in connection with the parallel passage, to which the evangelist assigns an earlier date, this is associated with the coming of the "Kingdom of God" in such a way as to make the two substantially one. The answer which he gives to the question when the Kingdom of God is coming is capable of two explanations, between which it is not possible to decide with absolute confidence. Jesus may have intended to declare that the Kingdom of God is set up within the hearts of men instead of being established, in accordance with the popular expectation, as an outward theocratic state ; or he may have meant that God's

<sup>1</sup> See the preceding section, near the end.

Kingdom was already established in their midst through his mission and that of his disciples. The statement that the Kingdom of God is not something to be watched for, or something of whose approaching advent there will be striking signs,<sup>1</sup> harmonises sufficiently well with both views; while the second interpretation is favoured by the consideration that the Kingdom of God had no place in the hearts of the unbelieving and captious Pharisees. As against this last objection it has been maintained that by "you" may be meant mankind and not merely the persons then addressed. This gives to the statement the force of a general law. The difference between the two interpretations is not, however, so great as it might at first sight seem. The Kingdom of God, whose foundations had been already laid in the acts and teachings of Jesus, was a spiritual and hence an invisible kingdom; and in any case Jesus clearly aims to disabuse the minds of his questioners of the false impression that there was to be a restoration of the throne of David. Turning to his disciples he strives to correct an equally erroneous impression of theirs, that the coming of the "Son of Man" is to be *with observation*. They will be looking for and expecting his Messianic exaltation and "will not see it." Yet—strange paradox—his "coming" will be so evident that no one can fail to see it, for the earth will be filled with its splendour. Before this there is to be bodily suffering and defeat—afterward his unseen presence and spiritual victory. This heavenly kingdom, whose near coming had been heralded by John, was at length to be built up, not on the ruins of the Davidic dynasty, but on the surer foundations laid by him whom John had baptised in the Jordan.

<sup>1</sup> The exact meaning of παρατηρήσεως = E. V. "observation," found nowhere else in the N. T., is not capable of determination.

## § 164. SIGNS ACCOMPANYING THE PAROUSIA

*Matt. xxiv., 29-31; Mark xiii., 24-27; Luke xxi., 25-28.*

Mark fixes the time of these signs with precision by his phrase *in those days*, referring to the time of the destruction of the city (see § 161). Matthew's *immediately*<sup>1</sup> is equally definite. In Luke the closeness of the connection obviates the necessity for any such note of time. While Matthew and Mark may have thought only of physical events when describing so graphically disturbances in sun, moon, and stars,<sup>2</sup> to which Luke only briefly refers, it is beyond reasonable doubt that the language of Jesus is to be understood altogether figuratively. The images employed are those by which the Jews were accustomed to symbolise the sorrows of adversity, when, as if in sympathy with the heart of man, all nature seems to put on robes of mourning. The literature of all nations furnishes so many examples of such imagery as to make it evident that in this rhetorical form we have a fixed natural type of poetic creation. All the language of this passage is easily paralleled in the Old Testament, where the judgments of God upon the nations are described.<sup>3</sup> In phrases borrowed from this source Jesus depicts the helpless and hopeless condition of the Jewish people after the overthrow of their city. In Luke this is described for the most part in plainer language, although a new figure is introduced, also Biblical,—that of *the roaring of the sea and the billows*.<sup>4</sup> Matthew alone speaks of the appearing at this

<sup>1</sup> ἐνθὺς, *enthūs*.

<sup>2</sup> The *powers of the heavens*, or *that are in the heavens*, are the heavenly bodies = O. T. "hosts of heaven."

<sup>3</sup> See Joel ii., 2, 10, 30, 31, iii., 15, 16; Ezek. xxx., 3, 18, xxxii., 7, 8; Is. xiii., 10, 13, xxiv., 23, xxxiv., 4, 1., 3; Am. viii., 9; Mic. iii., 6; Jer. iv., 23-28; Judg. v., 4, 5; Ps. xviii., 7, lx., 2; 2 Sam. xxii., 8; Hag. ii., 6, 21.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. Ps. xlii., 7.

time of *the sign of the Son of Man*, the best explanation of which is that then the coming of the Son of Man will be made manifest. No special outward sign is intended. "All the tribes of the land [of Palestine]" will mourn, seeing the temple-worship forever brought to an end and a new kingdom established upon its ruins by the coming of the Son of Man. This coming, so closely following upon the destruction of Jerusalem, is figuratively described as a *coming on the clouds of heaven*.<sup>1</sup> So the angels to be sent throughout the world to gather *the elect* are not heavenly messengers but all the agencies of whatever sort by which men are to be brought into the Kingdom of God on earth. In place of this Luke has words of encouragement based upon the assurance that the beginning of these events will be the sign of approaching deliverance for those sons of the Kingdom who have been suffering persecution "for righteousness' sake."

#### § 165. SECOND PARABLE OF THE FIG-TREE.

*Matt. xxiv.*, 32, 33; *Mark xiii.*, 28, 29; *Luke xxi.*, 29-31.

Jesus declares that, as the bursting forth of the buds of the trees in the springtime is a sure sign that summer is coming, so the events already spoken of will plainly indicate the speedy advent of the Son of Man. Matthew and Mark particularise the fig-tree, whose leaves come out so late, even following the first appearance of the fruit, that their unfolding is a sign that the season is well advanced (see § 137). Luke, apparently not aware of this fact, enlarges the illustration, making it include *all trees*. In the application of the simile in Matthew and Mark it is "he," *i. e.*, the Son of Man, whose coming all signs will show to be near at hand, while Luke uses the synonymous phrase "Kingdom of God."

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Dan. vii., 13, 14; Deut. xxxiii., 26; Is. xix., 1; Ps. xviii., 5-16, xcvi., 1-5; Zech. ix., 14.

## § 166. TIME OF THE PAROUSIA.

*Matt. xxiv., 34-36, Mark xiii., 30-32; Luke xxi., 32, 33.*

The question of Matt. xxiv., 3 (§ 158), is now answered. It is declared that what has been predicted will come to pass during that generation,<sup>1</sup> but that no one can tell, for God only knows, just when. Jesus speaks with absolute confidence as to the result, concerning which he believes it to be impossible that he can be mistaken; but the causes leading up to it are too complex for anyone to determine their exact working. What he says about the heavens and earth passing away is not an affirmation of their perishableness, but rather an illustration drawn from their acknowledged stability. It was conceivable that the order of the physical universe might change, but it was not conceivable that he should be mistaken in his interpretation of the signs of the times.

## § 167. ILLUSTRATIVE PARALLELS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT

*Matt. xxiv., 28, 37-41; Luke xvii., 26-37.*

To those who have not heeded the warnings of Jesus the threatened crisis will come as suddenly and unexpectedly as the flood came in the days of Noah and the destruction of the cities of the plain in the time of Lot. Men will be pursuing their ordinary occupations and conducting themselves in every way as though no danger were at hand. The various phrases "the coming of the Son of Man" (Matthew), "the days of the Son of Man" and "the day in which the Son of Man is revealed" (Luke), in this connection naturally point

<sup>1</sup> The lifetime of a generation is not here to be fixed by modern standards; all that is meant is that some then living will see the fulfilment of the prediction. See Matt. xvi., 28; Luke ix., 27.

again to the destruction of Jerusalem as the first act in the great world-drama. Although nothing is directly said about flight, yet in Luke, who has here (verse 31) the injunctions of Matt. xxiv., 17, 18 (§ 161), the mention of Lot's flight from Sodom is pertinent only on the supposition that his course is cited as an example to be followed. The turning back of Lot's wife is made a type of that hesitation which, in the impending crisis, will cost many their lives. With the mention of this incident Luke couples words about the saving and losing of life (verse 33) which Matthew has in x., 39 (§ 93). According to both Matthew and Luke Jesus predicts many separations of friends and acquaintances, whether from choice or chance, "in that day."<sup>1</sup> The question of the disciples as to the location of these events shows that even yet they are not able to enter into the thought of Jesus. His enigmatic answer points to Jerusalem as the carcass about which the Roman vultures<sup>2</sup> are to hover.

## § 168. THE PARABLE OF THE UNJUST JUDGE.

*Luke xviii., 1-8.*

There is here this peculiarity,—that the evangelist states at the outset the purpose of the parable, which is to emphasise the need of constant prayer for the speedy coming of the kingdom of heaven. *Always* means "without ceasing until the desired end is attained." The parable is an argument from the less to the greater. If a judge whose sense of right did not lead him to do justice to one who was entitled to his protection could yet be influenced by the selfish motive of personal ease to do what was his duty, with how much more

<sup>1</sup> In Luke "that night" is a part of "that day." Matthew has the indefinite "then," referring generally to the parousia (see verse 37).

<sup>2</sup> The translation *eagles* is not here allowable; for an eagle will not feed upon carrion



confidence may the waiting and suffering followers of Jesus expect their prayers for deliverance to be promptly answered, even though judgment may now seem to them to be long delayed! The serious concluding question suggests the probability of the slow progress of Christian truth even after the removal of the chief obstacles presented by present conditions. Some have stumbled over this parable, because it seemed to them that God was compared to an unjust judge; but it is only the persistence of the suppliant which is cited as a lesson to the disciples, and the character of the judge is a mere incidental circumstance having no relation whatever to the moral of the story.<sup>1</sup>

#### § 169. FAITHFUL AND UNFAITHFUL SERVANTS AND THEIR REWARDS.

*Matt. xxiv., 42-51; Luke xii., 35-48, xvii., 7-10.*

To encouragement to patient and prayerful waiting are now added admonitions to faithfulness in watching for the coming of the Son of Man. Something is to be done, not merely something to be waited for. All that Luke has which is parallel with Matthew and especially suitable to the present connection he places much earlier and in the midst of general instructions to the disciples. His first two verses call to mind the parable of the next section; but here the occasion thought of may not be that of the master's own wedding but only some marriage-feast to which he has been

<sup>1</sup> In a similar way Theocritus compares the anxious activity of Hercules seeking for the missing boy Hylas to the fierce haste with which a savage lion rushes down from the mountain in search of a fawn which he hears crying afar off and of which he would fain make a meal. The comparison is limited to the one circumstance of eager haste in the lion and the lion-hearted hero, the altogether different objects of desire in the two cases being only incidentals of the double picture.

invited. The master is represented as rewarding the faithful waiting of his servants in a most remarkable manner—by giving them a feast at which he ministers to them with his own hands. Again the suddenness of the appearing of the Son of Man is likened both in Matthew and Luke to the unexpected coming of the house-breaker when the master of the house is not upon the watch. According to Luke, Peter inquires whether by the “servants” in the quasi-parable are meant *all* (disciples?) or only the twelve. The reply of Jesus, which Matthew has without the question, by its use of the word “steward” points to the apostles as the ones upon whom their master wishes especially to impress this important lesson. They are not common servants, but they are intrusted with the greatest responsibilities. Then in Luke follows the general lesson that obligation is in proportion to knowledge and that the Divine chastisements are heaviest where the consciousness of neglect of duty is greatest. The remaining verses, which are without any logical connection in the chapter from which they are taken, fitly stand here by virtue of their relation to the general subject of the section. They teach that no man is entitled to a reward for doing his duty. A debtor is not deserving of praise for paying his debts, but only of blame for neglecting to pay them when he is able.

### § 170. THE PARABLE OF THE TEN VIRGINS.

*Matt. xxv., 1-13; Luke xiii., 25.*

The adverb of time <sup>1</sup> with which Matthew introduces this parable connects it closely with the preceding portion of the discourse. The time is that designated by the same adverb in xxiv., 40—the time of the parousia. The opening sentence is strikingly compendious; for the real terms of comparison are the circumstances attending the establishment of the

<sup>1</sup> *τότε, τότε.*

kingdom of heaven by the Son of Man and circumstances which might accompany the celebration of a wedding-feast. It has been questioned whether all the details of the narrative conform strictly to the customs of the times. So much is clear, that we have here a picture of ten bridesmaids waiting to meet the bridegroom and escort him by torchlight to the marriage-feast. Not knowing just when he is to come, half of them carelessly neglect to make preparation in time and so miss the joys of the festival. The parable repeats the lesson of watchfulness twice before given<sup>1</sup>—a lesson without point if the coming of the Son of Man was not something to be looked for in the lifetime of the disciples. The passage from Luke, although having no direct relation to the parable, parallels some of its details.

### § 171. THE PARABLE OF THE TALENTS.<sup>2</sup>

*Matt. xxv., 14-30 ; Luke xix., 11-27.*

Luke makes this parable to have been spoken in or near Jericho, when Jesus and his company were on the point of setting out for Jerusalem. The reason for its utterance is said to have been the belief of some, perhaps of the mass of his followers, that the Kingdom of God was on the very point of appearing<sup>3</sup>; for would not a short day's march bring them to the city where the Messiah was to claim and take possession of his own? To attempt to check somewhat this visionary enthusiasm by hinting at the mistake of looking upon the coming of the Kingdom as an event of the immediate future is the purpose of the parable. Matthew, making the story a part of the eschatological discourse, assigns to it no special occasion. So in the parable itself Matthew speaks

<sup>1</sup> In Matt. xxiv., 42, 44.

<sup>2</sup> Including the parable of the *minæ* or pounds.

<sup>3</sup> ἀναφαίνεσθαι (*anaphainēsthai*) = "to show up."

only of a man going away from home, while Luke states that the purpose of the journey was to secure either an original grant or a confirmation of power from some overlord. In both forms of the narrative certain servants, representing the disciples of Jesus, are given a trust to administer, although, according to Matthew, greater responsibilities are imposed upon some than upon others. Balancing these and other resemblances and differences, it is not easy to determine whether we have here two distinct parables or only one parable variously reported. That reward is proportioned to faithfulness of service, and that gifts unused are lost, while every effort put forth brings strength for further effort, is the lesson of both. The *nobleman* in Luke (the *man* in Matthew) is Jesus, the *citizens* who are not willing to be under his rule are the Jewish people as a whole; the *enemies* who are to be slain are those of the Jews who are to perish in the downfall of Jerusalem. Not often does a parable contain so many incidents which appear to be significant. The fundamental thought, however, is one,—that the disciples are to labour as well as wait.

## § 172. CONCLUSION OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL DISCOURSE.

*Matt. xxv., 31-46; Mark xiii., 33-37; Luke xxi., 34-38.*

Each of the Synoptists differs from the other two in the way in which he ends this discourse of Jesus. Mark closes it with an injunction to watchfulness, enforcing the injunction by brief parabolic utterances. At the very end it is indicated that what has been spoken to the twelve, although intended specially for them, is applicable to all disciples. It was the duty of all to live as though the present were to be the last moment of opportunity. The tenor of Luke's ending is the same, but, as before, he has more distinctly in his

mind the catastrophe which impends over "all who are settled anywhere in the country" of Palestine.' To the discourse the evangelist appends a brief historical note concerning the daily movements of Jesus at this time. According to Matthew, Jesus ends his discourse with a pictorial description of the judgment which is to attend the parousia. Borrowing a figure from the custom of Oriental kings, who were wont to dispense justice from their thrones, he speaks of the Son of Man as sitting *on the throne of his glory*, i. e., "on his glorious throne." If *all the angels with him* is more than an addition to the picture due to the vivid apocalyptic fancy of the evangelist, it may rest upon the promise of Jesus made to the twelve (see Matt. xix., 28) that they should have an honorable share in the judgment of the parousia. The judgment then spoken of, however, was only the judgment of *the twelve tribes of Israel*, while now *all the nations* are brought to the bar of justice. There is, then, here some advance in the thought. It can no longer be the people of Jerusalem or even of Palestine alone who are to be judged in the destruction of the city and the devastation of the whole land, for the judgment now spoken of is declared to be world-wide. Such a judgment can be conceived of only as the testing of men's lives by the standard of Christ's teachings. Verses 35, 40, 42, 45, rehearse the law in accordance with which judgment is to be passed—the law of brotherly love. The *righteous* (verse 37) are those who have ministered to the wants of their brothers in need; the condemned are those who have neglected this first of Christian duties. The former in their well-doing have not been distinctly conscious of obeying a Divine command; the latter in their blindness have not seen, or seeing have neglected, the duty lying directly in

<sup>1</sup> Here, as in Matt. xxiv., 30,  $\gamma\tilde{\eta}$  is not "the earth." The reason for holding to this view, against the opinion of some good critics, is, that any reference to the world at large would be altogether incongruous with the main teaching of this and other discourses.

their path. The words which close this dramatic prefiguring of the time when the truth taught by Jesus shall be recognised as the standard by reference to which the conduct of all men is to be judged, contain no such prediction of either weal or woe as has commonly been drawn from them. The "æonian"<sup>1</sup> consequences of conduct of any kind are not necessarily endless, and the word translated "punishment" primarily denotes correction with a view to reformation, not retributive chastisement (*a*).<sup>2</sup>

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 289) While almost all commentators find in the earlier part of the eschatological discourse of Jesus a reference to the destruction of Jerusalem as *a* coming of the Son of Man, very many imagine that somewhere in the discourse Jesus ceases to speak of this near event and begins to tell of another coming to judgment which is to take place in some age still remotely future. The fact that among those who hold this view there is a wide difference of opinion as to where in the discourse the change referred to takes place, of itself casts doubt upon the reality of any such change. Some think that the transition is at xxiv., 29, others at xxiv., 36, others at xxiv., 43, others at xxv., 1, and still others at xxv., 31. Such a close connection has been traced up to xxv., 31, that no reasonable doubt can remain as to the unity of the discourse in its earlier portions. If there is a break anywhere it must be at this point.

One carefully comparing the Authorised Version and the Revised Version will notice that in the latter *but* has been inserted at the beginning of xxv., 31. This little word is intended to represent the Greek conjunction *δέ*,\* to which, by this rendering, an adversative force is sought to be given.†

<sup>1</sup> See § 66 (*a*).

<sup>2</sup> But see Thayer, 353 (*κόλασις*), and Trench's *Synonyms of the N. T.*, § 7.

\* *δέ*.

† Following Olshausen, who says that the form of expression "indicates something different as the subject of discourse in the similitude that follows."

It would be easy to cite several authorities of the first rank in support of the statement, which probably no competent Greek scholar would venture to controvert, that the usual function of this particle is to continue a discourse without essential change, and that it is employed where in English we either use "and" or employ no conjunction whatever,—the latter having been the choice of King James's translators in the present passage. The Revised Version itself uses *and* at the beginning of verses 38 and 39. To the indication of close logical connection which is furnished by the use of this particle at xxv., 31, is to be added the presumption derived from similarities of expression. In order to parallel some of the most striking verbal peculiarities of this passage one has only to turn to Matt. x., 23, xvi., 27, 28, xxiv., 30, xxvi., 64; Mark viii., 38, ix., 1; Luke ix., 26, 27, xxii., 69.

*Genesis of the Eschatological Discourse.*—Between the contents of the Sermon on the Mount and those of the discourse embraced in §§ 159–172 there is so marked a difference in many respects that one cannot refrain from asking himself whether it is possible that the two can have emanated from the same source. The difficulty increases as we call to mind several important circumstances of the Galilean ministry as well as the general tenor of the life and teaching of Jesus during this decisive period. In our detailed examination of the discourse itself apparent discrepancies between the real thought of Jesus and the meaning attached to his words by the evangelists have not infrequently forced themselves upon our attention. It is inconceivable that the experiences of one or even of three years (if his mission was so long) could have been able to transform the sober-minded, practical teacher of Galilee, whose independence of thought and freedom from bondage to popular tradition was one of his most striking characteristics, into a self-deluded visionary; therefore some explanation of the peculiar structure of this discourse must be sought for if we would save from it that which is of real value. First of all it must be clearly recognised that the securing and preserving of an exact and truthful report of such a discourse was in the nature of the case a moral impossibility. Who among the unlettered band of the disciples of Jesus would think, at this time of imminent peril, of writing down what he could imperfectly

remember of the Master's words? Evidently a long time must have elapsed—weeks and months if not years—before this discourse first came from the hand of the scribe. Nevertheless a tenacious memory may have here preserved very much of the substance and not a little of the form of what was actually spoken by Jesus during the last days at Jerusalem. That which cannot have been accurately reported is the portion which intends to represent Jesus as an apocalyptic seer; although even here the evangelists have generally left us a clue for discovering the truth which they unwittingly obscure.

Whatever may have been the ambition of Jesus in his early youth, the scene of the Temptation in the wilderness represents him as resisting every enticement to a career of worldly honour. Soon follows the conviction that God's Kingdom on earth is a kingdom of the spirit only, and that no son of David is to be the Lord's Anointed. John the Baptist might expect a Messiah such as some of the old prophets had foretold; but this expectation, according to the testimony of Jesus himself, placed him outside of the true kingdom of heaven.\* Never does Jesus during his Galilean ministry encourage his disciples to speak of him as the Messiah, or approve of their so doing, even after he has acknowledged the truthfulness of Peter's declaration at Cæsarea Philippi that he is "the Christ, the Son of the living God." Having come to a recognition of these two truths—that the Kingdom of God is a spiritual kingdom to be set up in the hearts and lives of men, and that God's Messiah is to be a servant and not a ruler of men, the way is open for his full acknowledgment to himself that his is a true Messianic mission. Henceforth he often uses familiar Messianic language, infusing into it new meanings which those who hear him are incompetent to understand. With the old phraseology they associate the old ideas and so think that he speaks of himself as the Messiah whom they have long been expecting. Besides, they have not forgotten that he willingly accepted Peter's declaration that he was the Christ. So the popular enthusiasm grew until his followers would fain take him and make him king, whether he would or no.† Even his sudden and violent death was not enough to destroy their hope "that it was he which should redeem Israel."‡

\* Matt. xi., 11.

† John vi., 15.

‡ Luke xxiv., 21.



The last question which they ask him after his reappearing and before his final departure is, "Dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?"\* Had he not more than once in his last days used expressions which seemed plainly to hint at his speedy return to them? That a return from the realm of the dead was not conceived to be a thing incredible is evident from the conjectures which had been made as to who Jesus was, when some said that he was "John the Baptist, some Elijah, and others Jeremiah or one of the prophets," † and from Herod's declaration that Jesus was John the Baptist risen from the dead.‡ Hence the possibility of the birth of that faith which found expression in the assurance that "this Jesus which was received up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven." § Around the thought expressed thus with comparative simplicity would soon cluster all that wealth of apocalyptic imagery which was associated with the concept of the coming of "the times of the restoration of all things," so that it would be no longer possible for anyone to say with confidence what were the sober though figurative expressions of Jesus and what the fancies ascribed to him by a later generation. So much of the Jerusalem discourse as is true apocalypse represents the belief of the early Church; so much of it as is simple prophecy of suffering ending in victory speaks to us from the heart of Jesus himself.

### § 173. THE CONSPIRACY

*Matt. xxvi., 1-5; Mark xiv., 1, 2; Luke xxii., 1, 2.*

*The passover and the unleavened bread* in Mark represent the two parts of the passover season, the passover proper being celebrated on the evening of the fourteenth day of the first month, and the seven following days being specially set apart for the eating of unleavened bread.<sup>1</sup> The feast was

\* Acts i., 6.

† Matt. xvi., 14.

‡ Matt. xiv., 2.

§ Acts i., 11.

<sup>1</sup> See Lev. xxiii., 4-8; Num. xxviii., 16, 17; Ezra vi., 19, 22; 1 Esd. i., 1-22.

instituted in commemoration of the passing over the children of the Hebrews when the first-born of the Egyptians were destroyed, and of the eating of unleavened bread in the haste of the departure from the land of bondage.<sup>1</sup> Two days before the passover members of the national council come together at the house of the high-priest Joseph, commonly called Caiaphas, to consult as to the best method of putting Jesus out of the way, which implies that extreme measures had been already practically determined upon. A little delay, however, seems to them desirable, since in anticipation of the passover time the city is already full of strangers from all parts of the country, among whom must be many Galileans—a people always inclined to turbulence and especially likely to resist any violence which might be offered to one of their own countrymen whom great numbers looked upon as a prophet. When, however, without any effort of their own, Jesus is placed fully within the power of his enemies, this hesitation vanishes and the execution of their plot is immediately hastened on.

§ 174. THE ANOINTING AT BETHANY (AND IN GALILEE?).

*Matt. xxvi., 6-13 ; Mark xiv., 3-9 ; Luke vii., 36-50.*

The anointing of an honoured guest was not so rare an occurrence as to make it unlikely that Jesus would have received such a token of respect on more than one occasion ; nevertheless the fact that the four evangelists all agree<sup>2</sup> in speaking of but one anointing is favourable to the theory of the varying of a single account in process of transmission. In the form in which the narratives have come down to us

<sup>1</sup> See Ex. xii., xiii., 1-10 ; Num. ix., 1-5 ; Deut. xvi., 1-8.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. John xii., 1-8.

that of Luke must stand by itself, while John may be recognised as being in substantial accord with Matthew and Mark, notwithstanding some striking points of difference.

In Matthew and Mark the scene is laid in Bethany at the house of a certain Simon, who is distinguished from others of the name by the fact of his having been affected with leprosy. Jesus was reclining at table.<sup>1</sup> The ointment used is said to have been contained in "an alabaster." There is nothing in the original text corresponding to *cruse* or *flask*. The ancients said "an alabaster," just as we say "a marble," "a bronze," "a copper," "a nickel," applying the name of the material to that which is made of it.<sup>2</sup> Jesus did not mean to say that this anointing had been done with the conscious purpose of preparing his body for burial, but, with the near prospect of death in view, this act seemed to him, as it really proved to be, one of the last offices of affection.

In Luke it is a Pharisee, also named Simon, who entertains Jesus. The woman is spoken of as a *sinner* = "a bad woman." It may be that dissoluteness of character is hereby intended to be ascribed to her.<sup>3</sup> There is no reason whatever for supposing that this woman was Mary Magdalene, spoken of in viii., 2, as having been cured of demonism by Jesus.<sup>4</sup> In the last clause of verse 47 gratitude is represented as following forgiveness, in accordance with the natural teaching of the incident related to Simon; but in the earlier part of the verse forgiveness is made to depend upon the manifestation of love. In its present form (which may not be an exact reproduction of the words of Jesus), the passage as a

<sup>1</sup> The rendering *sat at meat* conveys the erroneous idea of an upright posture. Couches were commonly used at table.

<sup>2</sup> So in Matt. xxvi., 15, ἀργύρια, "silvers" = "silver-pieces." Cp. Ger. "Silberling."

<sup>3</sup> See passages from Greek and Latin authors cited by Wetstein *in loco*.

<sup>4</sup> See § 125.

whole is perhaps intended to set forth the reciprocal action of love and forgiveness.

### § 175. THE TREACHERY OF JUDAS.

*Matt. xxvi., 14-16; Mark xiv., 10, 11; Luke xxii., 3-6.*

That the offer of Judas to betray his master was made to the chief priests indicates that their desire to compass the death of Jesus<sup>1</sup> had become known to him. Luke alone ascribes the treason of Judas to the prompting of Satan; but this may be only a poetical way of describing the temptation which took possession of him. Mark and Luke say that the chief priests agreed to reward Judas for his favour; Matthew declares that they actually paid<sup>2</sup> him in advance thirty pieces of silver.<sup>3</sup>

### § 176. PREPARATION FOR THE PASSOVER MEAL.

*Matt. xxvi., 17-20, Mark xiv., 12-17; Luke xxii., 7-14.*

The question whether the date of the last meal which Jesus ate with his disciples was the 13th or the 14th of the month is much debated.<sup>4</sup> Between the Synoptists and John

<sup>1</sup> See Matt. xxvi., 3, 4.

<sup>2</sup> ἔστρωσαν literally means "placed," *i. e.*, in the balance, and therefore "weighed out"; but counting is likely to have been often substituted for weighing. At the present day in some English banks gold and silver pieces are weighed and not counted.

<sup>3</sup> The amount is so small—less than twenty dollars, or four pounds, if the silver pieces were shekels—as to have led to the conjecture that the primitive tradition is represented by Mark and Luke, who say nothing about the amount, and that the number thirty crept into the record from Zech. xi., 12, from the LXX. of which Matthew seems to have derived his phraseology. Cp. Ex. xxi., 32.

<sup>4</sup> There is a thorough treatment of the question in "The Character of Christ's Last Meal," by Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xi.

there appears to be an irreconcilable disagreement, although there are some who think it possible to remove the difficulty. The present section speaks of preparations for the celebration of the passover ; but whether or not Jesus and his disciples sacrificed and ate the paschal lamb, according to custom, is nowhere stated. According to Mark and Luke there was something mysterious in the directions given to the two messengers who were sent by Jesus to complete arrangements previously made by him for the use of a room for the pass-over meal ; while Matthew, by employing the vague " such a one " <sup>1</sup> to designate the individual who was to provide the room, indicates either that he considers it unnecessary to be more definite or that he has forgotten the man's name.

### § 177. PREDICTION OF THE BETRAYAL.

*Matt. xxvi., 21-25 ; Mark xiv., 18-21 ; Luke xxii., 21-23.*

It is during the supper that Jesus makes the startling announcement that he is about to be betrayed by one of the twelve, who is then present and sharing with them the common meal. Matthew and Mark represent the disciples as asking, one after another, *Is it I?*—by the very form of the question (as presented in the Greek) deprecating an affirmative answer. According to Matthew, Judas receives to his question the direct reply, " You said it," <sup>2</sup> which is equivalent to " It is," as examples from the Talmud make evident. The Fourth Gospel <sup>3</sup> has an account which is fuller and in some respects different from that of the Synoptists, who, however, do not altogether agree among themselves, especially with regard to the order of events, Luke placing the announcement of the betrayal near the close of the supper, while Matthew and Mark give the impression that it took place during the early part of the meal.

<sup>1</sup> δεινα (*dēina*), found nowhere else in the N. T.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. xxvi., 64.

<sup>3</sup> xiii., 21-30.

§ 178. THE LAST SUPPER.<sup>1</sup>

*Matt. xxvi., 26-29; Mark xiv., 22-25; Luke xxii., 15-20.*

In the introductory sentences which Luke alone has (verses 15-17) Jesus plainly declares that he will not again eat of the passover meal with his disciples until it (the passover) is *fulfilled*. As this fulfilment is to be *in the kingdom of God*, it must be a figurative and not a literal passover that is meant. So the concluding words in Matthew and Mark, corresponding to Luke's verse 18, refer to a spiritual communion with the disciples when the kingdom of God shall have been established upon earth. Jesus, distributing the bread and wine which had been provided for their repast, likens this food and drink to his body and blood.<sup>2</sup> Matthew and Mark agree in having the simple declaration *This is my body*, to which Luke adds *which is given for you*, and Paul "which is for you." With regard to the cup, in Mark mention is made only of the fact that all the disciples drank from it, while according to Luke Jesus called upon them so to do. In Luke also more than one cup is referred to, the first being offered to the disciples before and the latter after the breaking of the bread. It is to the latter only that a symbolic significance is expressly attached. Before this they had been eating the ordinary passover meal. The conclusion of the meal is to some extent separated from the rest by the typical use which Jesus makes of its elements. The ambiguity of the word translated *covenant*,<sup>3</sup> which may be rendered either "covenant" or "testament," leaves the meaning here somewhat uncertain. The reference may be either to a covenant different from that which Jehovah made with his people of old (which must be the meaning if the word *new*, found in Luke,

<sup>1</sup> Cp. 1 Cor. xi., 23-25.

<sup>2</sup> ἔσθιν, "is," here, as often, indicates a typical resemblance and not identity.

<sup>3</sup> διαθήκη, *diathēkē*.

is genuine), or the sacrifice of his life may have been looked upon by Jesus as a legacy to his disciples and the world. In either case his death is referred to as being for the good of mankind. Luke is the only one of the evangelists who has the injunction, after the passing of the cup, *this do in remembrance of me (a)*.

#### NOTE.

(a, p. 298) Paul, in the passage already cited, makes this injunction to have been given in connection with the passing both of the bread and the wine. Considering that the early Mark-record does not give us these words, it is conceivable that they, as well as the additions to *This is my body*, formed no part of the early tradition, but came into the record after the establishment of the Lord's Supper as a memorial rite. That Jesus was not consciously instituting a sacrament for a church which as yet had no existence, but was only asking of the twelve that, whenever they should meet together for a common meal after his departure from them, they should remember how he had given his body and blood, that is, his whole life, for them, is the only view which does justice to the simplicity of his language and its perfect fitness to the circumstances of the occasion.

#### § 179. PREDICTION OF PETER'S DENIAL.

*Matt. xxvi., 30-35; Mark xiv., 26-31; Luke xxii., 31-34.*

It is before leaving the supper-chamber, according to Luke, but on the way to the Mount of Olives, according to Matthew and Mark, that Jesus foretells the defection of the apostles, but especially of Peter, who should have been the last to desert him. In Matthew and Mark this is represented as a fulfilment of prophecy; but the passage quoted<sup>1</sup> is not prophetic in its original form. Jehovah is poetically represented as addressing the avenging sword and saying, "Awake, O

<sup>1</sup> Zech. xiii., 7.

sword, against my shepherd, and against the man who is my fellow; smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered," — the shepherd being the king of Judah contemporary with the prophet, while the sheep are the people of Israel. The statement in Luke's 31st verse recalls the temptation of Job, which was by Divine permission. The faithfulness of all the twelve<sup>1</sup> was to be tried, but it was Peter whom Jesus most of all desired to have true to him. In *when once thou hast turned again* there is a recognition of a defection followed by a renewal of courage. The substance of the prediction of Jesus is that Peter will deny him over and over again before morning,—although it is only in Mark that a repeated denial is spoken of.<sup>2</sup>

#### § 180. CONTRAST BETWEEN THE PAST AND THE FUTURE.

*Luke xxii., 35-38.*

The language in which reference is made to the first sending out of the twelve conforms not so much to ix., 3, which contains the instructions said to have been given to them, as to x., 4, addressed to the seventy (see § 88). In the injunction to the disciples to provide themselves with swords there is only a recognition of the present difficulties of their situation, as though he had said, "but now you will need to be on your guard against enemies." When they show by their reply, *Here are two swords*, that they take his words literally and suppose him to be enjoining upon them to arm themselves, he waives any explanation, merely saying "That is enough."<sup>3</sup> The quotation in verse 37 is from Is. liii., 12,

<sup>1</sup> The pronoun is plural and so cannot refer to Peter alone.

<sup>2</sup> τρις (*tris*), *thrice*, if to be understood strictly, probably crept *ex eventu* into the tradition followed by Mark.

<sup>3</sup> Pfeiderer (*The New World* for September, 1899, pp. 431-433) altogether mistakes the true ground of such an interpretation. It



where the application of the words is to the righteous portion of the people of Israel, whose sufferings in exile are likened to the punishments of malefactors. Whether in the last clause of the verse Jesus intends to state that there is about to be a fulfilment of this saying through his condemnation and death, or whether the statement is only a declaration that his end is near, must remain uncertain.

### § 181. GETHSEMANE.

*Matt. xxvi., 36-46; Mark xiv., 32-42; Luke xxii., 39-46.*

The place to which Jesus withdrew was across the brook Kidron,<sup>1</sup> on the slope of the Mount of Olives, and would seem to have derived its name of "Gethsemane," or "oil-press," from the fact that there was or formerly had been there an oil-press among or near the olive-trees. It is to be presumed that all the twelve were with him excepting Judas.<sup>2</sup> Three—those who had been with him on the Mount of Transfiguration—he takes apart from the rest, and, retiring a little even from these, he engages in prayer. The feelings which prompted this act are described in terms which, as is so often the case with the language of emotion, it is difficult to represent by exact equivalents. *To be greatly amazed*

rests upon no other conception than that which is derived from the uniform character of the teachings and conduct of Jesus. In the light of the doctrine of the Sermon on the Mount, as well as of Matt. xxvi. 32, and John xviii. 36, it is impossible to think of Jesus as counselling his followers to resist their enemies by force. Pfleiderer's interpretation is also wide of the mark in that it represents Jesus to have been consulting for his own safety, while the record represents the remark about the procuring of swords as having been made altogether with reference to the prospective condition of the disciples.

<sup>1</sup> See John xviii., 1.

<sup>2</sup> Weiss even includes Judas, whom he supposes to have left the group later, but before the arrest.

comes short of expressing the anxiety and dread which Mark's Greek word<sup>1</sup> implies. A better rendering of the two related infinitives would be "to be greatly troubled and depressed." Matthew's corresponding verb expresses sadness rather than fear and is properly enough translated *to be sorrowful*. When Jesus says that his soul is sorrowful *unto death* he uses the strongest possible language to give expression to the intensity of his mental agony. Mark, in preserving the Chaldee *Abba* as well as its Greek equivalent, probably conforms to the usage of his time. Three times (according to Luke once only) Jesus comes to his three chosen disciples and finds them sleeping. His injunctions to them, first to be on the watch, then, as if despairing of arousing them to any activity, to sleep on and get the rest which their fatigued bodies seemed to demand, and finally, when the traitor suddenly appears, to arouse themselves and go with him, indicate rapid changes of feeling under the influence of changing conditions (*a*).

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 301) What Luke says about the presence of an angel strengthening Jesus in his agony has every appearance of being a legendary accretion ; but there is not quite the same reason for doubting the authenticity of the account of the bloody sweat, since there appear to be well-attested modern instances of the exudation of blood from the surface of the body. Both verses (43, 44) lack full manuscript attestation, although generally retained by modern editors.

## § 182. THE ARREST

*Matt. xxvi., 47-56, Mark xiv., 43-52; Luke xxii., 47-53.*

Those who arrested Jesus are described by all the Synoptists as a "mob."<sup>2</sup> That they were armed with "swords and

<sup>1</sup> ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι (*ēkthambēisthai*), found in the N. T. only in Mark, who uses it in somewhat varying senses.

<sup>2</sup> ὄχλος, *ōchlōs*.

*clubs*'' indicates that they were not altogether a military force. John (xviii., 3) speaks both of Roman soldiers and officials of the Sanhedrin, but the Synoptists appear to intend no reference to the former.<sup>1</sup> When one of the followers of Jesus resists the arrest and wounds one of those making it,<sup>2</sup> Jesus deprecates the resort to violence, and, according to Luke, immediately heals the wounded man.<sup>3</sup> Matthew makes Jesus to have intimated (verse 53) that, if it had been the will of God that he should escape from his enemies, a providential way of deliverance would have been provided. It is also quite in accordance with Matthew's habitual predestinarian point of view that Jesus is represented as considering his fate to have been foreordained (verse 54). The meaning of Luke's concise *Suffer thus far* (verse 51) is by no means clear. The connection of thought is best preserved by supposing that Jesus endeavoured to restrain his disciples by enjoining upon them "to suffer even this" violence to be done to him rather than to resist by force.<sup>4</sup> Mark's last two verses, peculiar to him, narrate an incident which, having no special significance in relation to the rest of the narrative, suggests that the evangelist had personal knowledge of the circumstance and perhaps was himself the young man in question. One clad only in a *linen cloth*<sup>5</sup> or wrapper was likely to have arisen in haste from his couch upon the announcement of what was going on.

<sup>1</sup> The Jewish authorities could hardly command the services of the Roman cohort.

<sup>2</sup> John (xviii., 10) says that it was Malchus, a servant of the high-priest, and that his assailant was Peter.

<sup>3</sup> Since the ear is said to have been severed from the body, it is hardly possible to look upon the story of its restoration as anything but legendary.

<sup>4</sup> See §180, p. 299.

<sup>5</sup> *σινδών* (*sindōn*), found only here in the N. T. in this sense

## § 183. THE TRIAL BEFORE THE SANHEDRIN.

*Matt. xxvi., 57-68; Mark xiv., 53-65; Luke xxii., 54, 55, 63-71.*

The circumstances of the trial of Jesus before the authorities of his own nation are described in substantially the same way by Matthew and Mark, but by Luke somewhat differently. All agree in saying that he was brought before Caiaphas, the chief-priest, but only Luke mentions that it was at his *house*. Matthew represents the scribes and elders as having previously assembled as if in expectation of the coming of their prisoner, while Mark seems to make the bringing of Jesus to have been the immediate occasion of their coming together. Mark also speaks of the *chief-priests* as present. The two together mention all the elements which went to make up the Sanhedrin. Yet it is not quite certain that this was a regularly called meeting of the council, which, according to established custom, could not properly be convened at night. The emergency, it is true, might seem to justify such a departure from traditional usage. Luke mentions no night gathering, but only a meeting of the Sanhedrin in the morning. According to the Fourth Gospel the first examination was before Annas, who, however, decided nothing, but passed the prisoner over to Caiaphas, "which was high-priest that year."<sup>1</sup> The testimony against Jesus, although spoken of as false, was so only by virtue of the meaning given to certain words of his by the witnesses; for, according to the Fourth Gospel,<sup>2</sup> he had said long before something like what was alleged.<sup>3</sup> Mark alone preserves the true meaning of Jesus when he represents him as speaking

<sup>1</sup> John xviii., 13.

<sup>2</sup> See ii., 19.

<sup>3</sup> John's interpretation of the words (ii., 21), however, seems too fanciful and was, as he himself says, not thought of until after the resurrection.

of the new temple as one to be *made without hands*. Such a spiritual temple he declares (according to Matthew) that he can and (according to Mark) will build upon the ruins of the national religion. To this charge Jesus makes no answer ; but when the high-priest asks him if he is the Christ, according to Matthew even demanding that he shall answer as upon oath, he makes a frank confession of his Messiahship. Nay more, he adds, in apocalyptic phrase, that " from that time on " <sup>1</sup> they will see him sitting at the right hand of God and coming (Matthew and Mark) upon (or with) the clouds of heaven. This lofty claim the high-priest chooses to consider blasphemous, in the sense of being derogatory to the Divine Majesty ; and nominally on the strength of this self-furnished evidence, but really, it would seem, in pursuance of a predetermined plan, Jesus is declared by the council to be worthy of death. This judgment makes him a criminal to whom no respect is supposed to be due, so that even some connected with the court disgrace themselves by treating him shamefully.

#### § 184. PETER'S DENIAL OF JESUS.

*Matt. xxvi., 69-75 ; Mark xiv., 66-72 ; Luke xxii., 56-62.*

In the last section the fact was mentioned of Peter's following into the court <sup>2</sup> of the high-priest those who had brought Jesus thither. Some additional circumstances are now introduced into the account, although the Synoptists appear to differ somewhat among themselves as to minor details.<sup>3</sup> Jesus was conducted within doors, while those not entitled to enter remained down in the courtyard, where a fire

<sup>1</sup> ἀπ' ἄρτι, *ap' arti*.

<sup>2</sup> "Court" is a word applicable to the area about which the palace was built.

<sup>3</sup> The text is also uncertain in several places.

had been kindled. Peter, when charged with being a follower of Jesus, denies all knowledge of him and withdraws into the passageway leading from the courtyard to the entrance. Matthew alone makes Peter's Galilean brogue<sup>1</sup> to have betrayed him. It was recognised that no Galilean was likely to be present at such a time unless he had a sympathetic interest in the fate of Jesus.

### § 185. THE HANDING OVER OF JESUS TO PILATE.

*Matt. xxvii., 1-2 ; Mark xv., 1 ; Luke xxiii., 1.*

It appears to be the intention of Matthew and Mark to describe a full meeting of the Sanhedrin in the morning for the purpose of giving effect to the action of the night before. Jesus had been declared worthy of death, but it was necessary to secure the confirmation of this judgment by the Roman governor, Pontius Pilate, before it could be effective. This morning consultation (supposing the verdict to have been pronounced the night before) was then simply for the purpose of considering how best to secure from the governor a decision conformable to their wishes. Apparently it was hoped that a striking impression would be made upon him by the whole body of the Sanhedrin appearing before him to ask for the execution of one whom they had found worthy of death. They seem to have hoped that he would not take the trouble to examine into the merits of the case for himself, or at least would make the trial a mere formal one, confirmatory of the verdict of the Jewish court.

<sup>1</sup> The Galileans are said to have had peculiarities both of pronunciation and vocabulary.

## § 186. THE FATE OF JUDAS.

*Matt. xxvii., 3-10.*

Towards the solution of the psychological problem suggested by the action of Judas here described exegesis can give no help. Various reasons both for his betrayal of Jesus and for his repentance have been suggested, but all, of course, are conjectural. The same is to be said with regard to the hypotheses which have been put forth with a view to harmonising this section with Acts i., 18, which has a different account of the manner of the death of Judas (*a*).

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 306) The passage quoted in verses 9 and 10 bears a considerable resemblance to Zech. xi., 12, 13, but does not occur at all in Jeremiah. The various hypotheses which have been hitherto suggested for the explanation of this discrepancy have been rendered superfluous by the recent discovery that the passage is present in no fewer than three ancient versions — a clear indication of its presence in some form of the original. A more complicated problem is that presented by the attempt of the evangelist to make the Old Testament passage fit the circumstances to which it is here applied. Between text corruptions and misinterpretations of the Hebrew the original meaning of the prophet's words has been altogether obscured. In fact all that Matthew really has in common with Zechariah is the mention of thirty pieces of silver and the word "potter." The prophet says nothing about the buying of a field. The words for "potter" and "treasury," which in the Hebrew are almost identical in form, may in some way have been confounded.

## § 187. THE EXAMINATION BEFORE PILATE.

*Matt. xxvii., 11-14; Mark xv., 2-5; Luke xxiii., 2-5.*

According to Luke the proceedings before Pilate commenced with charges against the prisoner by those who had

conducted him to the governor. They charge him first with corrupting the people,<sup>1</sup> in what manner they do not say, unless the two following accusations are simply explanatory of this, which is not unlikely. It was naturally supposed that advising against the payment of tribute to the Roman government, if it could be proved against Jesus, would be looked upon by the governor as a treasonable act, and, attributing to Jesus the Messianic claims made for him by his followers, they thought to brand him as a royal pretender whom the imperial government was bound to put out of the way in self-defence. That he is rightly called "king of the Jews" Jesus does not deny<sup>2</sup>; to whatever else is brought forward against him he makes no answer. Pilate, apparently understanding the real motives of the prosecutors of Jesus as well as the essential falseness of their charges, declares that no case has been made out against him.<sup>3</sup>

## § 188. PILATE AND HEROD.

*Luke xxiii., 6-16.*

The accusers had incidentally let drop the word "Galilee" in such a way as to suggest to Pilate that Jesus might be a Galilean, and, finding upon inquiry that this was the case, he handed him over to Herod, the tetrarch of Galilee, who happened at that time to be in the city. This, although on its face an act of courtesy, may have been dictated either by motives of policy or by a desire to get rid of an unpleasant

<sup>1</sup> So one of the charges against Socrates was that he corrupted the youth of Athens.

<sup>2</sup> In Pilate's question there is a tone of contempt: "Can such a man as *you* be a king?"

<sup>3</sup> John xviii., 29 ff., makes clearer the reasons for Pilate's judgment. What Jesus is there represented to have said could not but have seemed to the governor to place "the king of the Jews" in the rank of harmless enthusiasts.



duty, rather than by a sense of the fitness of things. The act in any case was pleasing to Herod, for he had had his curiosity aroused with regard to the Galilean agitator and had wished that he could see some of the wonderful works which were attributed to him ; but Jesus preserves a dignified silence in his presence, with the result that Herod, piqued at his apparent assumption of superiority, treats him abusively and, putting on him in mockery a splendid robe, probably one outworn and discarded by the sovereign, he sends him back to Pilate, thus returning the latter's courtesy. The result of this interchange of civilities is said to have been the reconciliation of the king and the governor, who, for some cause, had before this been estranged. Pilate thus again has the case on his hands. His next move is to try to satisfy the clamour of the Jews for the punishment of Jesus by inflicting upon him, though innocent, a slight chastisement.

#### § 189. JESUS AND BARABBAS.

*Matt. xxviii., 15-26 ; Mark xv., 6-15 ; Luke xxiii., 17-25.*

The evangelists give the impression that Pilate desired to release Jesus but was unable to resist the popular clamour for the execution of the sentence passed by the Sanhedrin. The custom of pardoning some prisoner at passover-time is one of which history makes no other mention. Mark says that the people called upon Pilate to do as was his wont, while Matthew makes the governor take the initiative. Mark represents Pilate as asking the people if they wish to have him release Jesus ; Matthew makes him present to them the alternative of the release of Jesus or of Barabbas, a notorious criminal. Both represent him as aware that the action of the hierarchy had been prompted by jealousy of the popularity of Jesus, and Pilate seems to have hoped that the verdict of the crowd on the present occasion would coincide with his

own inclination and make it possible for him to do justice under cover of granting a favour. Matthew seems to intimate that he may also have been influenced toward clemency by the intercession of his wife. When overpowered by the popular clamour against Jesus, he tries to free himself from all responsibility by the symbolic act of washing his hands in the presence of the crowd ; then he orders the scourging of *the righteous man* preparatory to his execution (*a*).

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 309) While Matthew (verse 26) and Mark (verse 15) explicitly mention a scourging of Jesus in connection with his condemnation to the cross by Pilate, Luke and John present the matter somewhat differently. According to Luke (xxiii., 16, 22), Pilate, addressing the assembled crowd, proposed to chastise Jesus and release him, hoping that they would be satisfied with this, but at length, being compelled to yield to their clamour, he *gave sentence that what they asked for should be done*. John (xix., 1) places the scourging before the condemnation and so appears to disconnect it altogether from the crucifixion. Luke and John may be brought into tolerable harmony with each other and with Matthew and Mark by supposing that Pilate, yielding to the demand of the Jews, ordered the scourging of Jesus preliminary to his crucifixion and then, feeling that he was acting contrary to the claims of justice, tried, but unsuccessfully, to draw back from the execution of the rest of the sentence.

## § 190. THE MOCKING.

*Matt. xxvii., 27-31 ; Mark xv., 16-20.*

John (xix., 2, 3), as well as Matthew and Mark, tells us that the soldiers made sport of Jesus by clothing him in a garment<sup>1</sup> of scarlet or purple, suggestive of the rich robes

<sup>1</sup> Matthew calls it a *chlamys* and John an *himatiön* : both indicate an outer garment, but the former is the more specific and dignified word.

of royalty, and also placed upon his head a mimic crown of acanthus (*a*). Matthew alone mentions the placing of a reed in his right hand for a sceptre, and that afterwards they smote him with his own mock symbol of power.

NOTE.

(*a*, p. 310) While Roman soldiers were naturally brutal and generally ready for any sport, however cruel, there is no reason for supposing that the so-called *crown of thorns* placed upon the head of Jesus was contrived for the direct purpose of torturing him. Like the purple robe, it was meant for mockery of his supposed royal pretensions, and would be likely to be made of whatever available material was nearest at hand, which seems to have been some branches of acanthus — a shrub always more or less spiny. While not troubling themselves to remove the spines, the soldiers would have no reason for selecting branches bearing only thorns; and the *Ecce Homo* of Christian art is the product of a morbid tendency to exaggerate those physical sufferings of Jesus which a perverted theology has felt the necessity of making heavy enough to outweigh the sins of the whole human race.

§ 191. ON THE WAY TO GOLGOTHA.

*Matt. xxvii., 32 : Mark xv., 21 ; Luke xxiii., 26-32.*

Executions took place without the city walls.<sup>1</sup> The Synoptists agree in saying that Jesus did not himself, according to custom, carry his cross<sup>2</sup> to the place of execution, but that one Simon of Cyrene was compelled to bear it, while John says that Jesus "went out bearing the cross for himself." The form of the Synoptic statement, however, is such as to suggest that Simon was pressed into the service of the soldiers on the way to Golgotha; so that the account of John may be considered as only less complete than that of the other evangelists but not inconsistent with it. Luke alone

<sup>1</sup> See Num. xv., 35, and cp. Heb. xiii., 12.

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix J.

has preserved a few words addressed by Jesus to the women who followed him weeping. They are words of commiseration for the fate which threatens them. The figurative and perhaps proverbial language of verse 31<sup>1</sup> may be paraphrased in some such way as this: "If I, though innocent, suffer thus, what shall be the fate of those whose sins are about to bring down upon their city the divine retribution?"

### § 192. THE CRUCIFIXION.

*Matt. xxvii., 33-44; Mark xv., 22-32; Luke xxiii., 33-43.*

The place of execution "was nigh to the city," as the Fourth Gospel tells us, and that is all that we know concerning it, except that its Hebrew and Chaldee name Golgotha signifies "skull."<sup>2</sup> Matthew and Mark both mention that some sort of artificially flavoured wine was offered to Jesus apparently before his crucifixion; but while the latter speaks of "myrrhed wine" which was likely to be agreeable to the taste, the former says that the wine was *mingled with gall*.<sup>3</sup> No other reason for his declining to drink it need be thought of than its unwelcome taste, since, according to Matthew, he did make trial of it. The supposition that "he would not take it because he knew that it was meant to stupefy"<sup>4</sup> is altogether gratuitous. All the evangelists alike simply state the fact that Jesus was crucified, leaving it to the imagination of the reader to supply the details with which everyone might be supposed to be familiar. As to three incidental circumstances the Synoptists are all agreed,—that two malefactors were crucified with Jesus; that the soldiers who

<sup>1</sup> Cp. the reading of the Sinaitic palimpsest: "They who do these things in the moist tree, what shall they do in the dry?"

<sup>2</sup> Cp. with the Synoptics John xix., 17, 20.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Ps. lxix., 21.

<sup>4</sup> Bruce, with Swete and others.

guarded him took possession of his garments,<sup>1</sup> and that an inscription setting forth his royal claim was placed upon the cross (*a*). Matthew and Mark speak of this superscription as being the recital of his alleged crime. Of the insulting remarks said by the Synoptists to have been addressed to Jesus as he hung upon the cross, John makes no mention (*b*).

#### NOTES.

(*a*, p. 312) The inscription is given in a different form by each of the four evangelists. From Mark's *The king of the Jews* through Luke's *This is the king of the Jews*, and Matthew's *This is Jesus the king of the Jews*, we come to John's most complex *Jesus of Nazareth, the king of the Jews*. Mark's originality and Luke's dependence upon him seem here to be indicated.

(*b*, p. 312) Matthew and Mark represent the two robbers as joining in these taunts; but Luke explicitly declares that one of them, on the contrary, actually reproved the other for his brutality. We might have supposed that Luke was in possession of some genuine tradition unknown to Matthew and Mark, except for the very suspicious character of verses 42, 43. The form of the Messianic belief implied in 42 was not yet born, and, whichever of the usual meanings is here to be attached to *Paradise*,\* it is incredible that such an assurance of Paradisiacal happiness as is contained in 43 should be given to one whose only evident ground of claim upon it was sympathy with a fellow-sufferer. Moreover, death upon

<sup>1</sup>The simple statement that the soldiers divided the garments among themselves by lot is amplified in the Fourth Gospel (xix., 23, 24) into a declaration that they "took his garments and made four parts, to every soldier a part," and that they cast lots for the seamless undergarment, "that the Scripture might be fulfilled, which saith, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots." But see Toy, 90, 91.

\* This word is so rare in the N. T. (elsewhere only in 2 Cor. xii., 4; Rev. ii., 7) as to render its meaning in the present passage somewhat doubtful. It may have reference either to the heavenly abodes or to that portion of Hades which was conceived of as the dwelling-place of the blest,—probably the latter.

that day was not a thing to be anticipated. Luke's story may be a myth developed out of the popular Jewish notion that a rabbi of special godliness could take with him into Paradise one who was associated with him in death. The first sentence of Luke's 34th verse, although considered by some of the best editors to be an interpolation, is probably a genuine utterance of Jesus, being conceived altogether in his spirit and not likely to have expressed the frame of mind in which his violent death must have left his followers. Its so general omission from the oldest MSS. may be satisfactorily accounted for by the natural disinclination of the friends of Jesus to excuse the deed of his murderers—a disinclination often manifested even at the present day. Yet it is quite possible that the reference was not at all to the Jews but only to the Roman executioners.

### § 193. DEATH OF JESUS.

*Matt. xxvii., 45-56; Mark xv., 33-41; Luke xxiii., 44-49.*

The hours during which Jesus was upon the cross cannot be exactly determined. Supposing all the evangelists to use the ordinary Jewish mode of reckoning, there is a lack of agreement in their testimony. John (xix., 14) says that sentence of condemnation was passed about the sixth hour, or twelve o'clock at noon according to our reckoning. The Synoptists speak of Jesus as being upon the cross at that hour, and Mark (xv., 25) makes the crucifixion to have taken place as early as the third hour—nine o'clock in the morning. According to the Synoptists (John being silent) death came about the ninth hour—three o'clock in the afternoon. Matthew and Mark speak of the body being taken down from the cross at evening, that is, about sunset—at that time of the year not later than seven o'clock. From the beginning of the crucifixion until the removal from the cross may then have been as much as nine or ten hours, or not more than six, during the last three or four of which there were no signs of life.

About the ninth hour, according to Matthew and Mark, Jesus cried with a loud voice, "My God, my God, why didst thou forsake me?"—words with which the Twenty-second Psalm opens.<sup>1</sup> That some may have really thought that *Eli Eli*, was a call for Elijah is possible; but, again, those who said *This man calleth Elijah* may have been merely playing upon words. Some of the more tender-hearted, perhaps interpreting his cry simply as one of pain, and aware that crucifixion brings with it intolerable thirst, offered him some sour wine, such as was in common use and of which the soldiers were likely to have a supply. According to John<sup>2</sup> Jesus had distinctly said, "I am thirsty." His last recorded words, as given in the Fourth Gospel,<sup>3</sup> were "It is ended," but in Luke, "Into thy hands I commit my spirit" (a).

With slight variations in the form of statement the Synop-  
tists all speak of the strong impression made upon the centurion in charge of the soldiers by the events of the crucifixion. Whether he said, "Truly this was a son of a God" (Matthew and Mark), or "Surely this was a just man" (Luke), the meaning is substantially the same (b). The Synop-  
tists all mention that the crucifixion of Jesus was witnessed from a distance by several women who had come with him from Galilee, and Luke also says that *all his acquaintance* were there with them; but none of the twelve are spoken of as having been present excepting the one "whom Jesus loved."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The genuineness of the utterance is attested by the fact of the preservation of the original words as well as of their Greek equivalent. Mark even gives them in their Aramaic and not, as Matthew, in their O. T. form. The Greek rendering is from the LXX., xxi., 2.

<sup>2</sup> xix., 28.

<sup>3</sup> xix., 30.

<sup>4</sup> See John xix., 26, xx., 2, xxi., 7, 20.

## NOTES.

(a, p. 314) Since neither from the testimony of history nor the data of natural science is any help derived for the explanation of the statement of the Synoptists that the land\* was shrouded in darkness from the sixth to the ninth hour, it is probable that we have here a true myth, the pall which seemed to hang over the face of nature typifying the gloom which was in the hearts of the friends of Jesus. So the story of the rending of the veil of the temple† may have been at first only the pictorial way in which someone of a later time gave expression to the thought that the overthrow of the temple-worship was a result of the tragedy upon Calvary. So with the account of the earthquake; although not in itself incredible as an accidental circumstance, notwithstanding that it is mentioned only by Matthew, yet its association with ghostly apparitions removes it from the realm of sober history. The Fourth Gospel knows nothing of any of these strange occurrences. As for what Matthew says about the resurrection and visible appearing of *many bodies of the saints*, the story would seem to have had its foundation in the early Christian belief that the resurrection of Jesus was to bring with it a speedy resurrection of those who had had faith in him. While this account is not in strict harmony with the idea of Paul that before Jesus none had risen from the dead, it is possible that in the statement that the risen ones did not appear in the city until after the resurrection of Jesus we see the influence of the apostle's view.

(b, p. 314) At the time when our Gospels were written the words of the centurion as given in Matthew and Mark may have come to be looked upon as an utterance of Christian faith, but in themselves they might equally well express the feeling of one who was not even a monotheist. The rendering of the Authorised Version, "*the Son of God*" is merely possible, not necessary.

\* It is possible that in the thought of the writers there may have been no limit to the extent of the darkness and that it was supposed to have extended over the whole earth.

† This was the curtain which separated the "Holy of holies" from the "Holy place." See Ex., xxvi., 31, and cp. Lev. xxi., 23, xxiv., 3; Heb. vi., 19, ix., 3, x., 20.



## § 194. THE ENTOMBMENT.

*Matt. xxvii., 57-61; Mark xv., 42-47; Luke xxiii., 50-56.*

The next day being a sabbath of unusual solemnity there was special reason for having the dead bodies taken down from the cross before nightfall. Pilate grants the request of Joseph of Arimathea, a rich councillor and a man of influence (whom Matthew and John speak of as a disciple of Jesus, and Mark and Luke represent somewhat vaguely as *looking for the kingdom of God*), that he may be allowed to receive the body of Jesus for burial. Mark says that Pilate was surprised, as well he might be, to hear of the so speedy death of Jesus, and that the petition of the councillor was not granted until the centurion in charge of the execution had been inquired of as to the fact and had given a satisfactory report. Joseph places the body wrapped in linen in a tomb recently hewn in the solid rock. We are to think of a contracted apartment chiefly if not entirely above ground, into which one might enter as into a little room. There might be a sarcophagus standing there in readiness to receive the body of the owner, or niches in the walls, as in the Roman catacombs. John<sup>1</sup> says that the tomb was in "a garden,"<sup>2</sup> using a word fitted to describe the suburban pleasure-grounds of a man of wealth who, whether then living at Arimathea on the borders of Samaria twenty miles to the north of Jerusalem, or having transferred his residence to the metropolis, might well have a country-seat beneath the city walls. That the tomb was his private property is, however, mentioned only by Matthew.

<sup>1</sup> *xix.*, 41.

<sup>2</sup> *Cp. 2 Kings xxi.*, 18, 26.

## § 195. THE WATCH AT THE TOMB.

*Matt. xxvii., 62-66.*

The events of this section of the narrative are described as taking place on *the day after the Preparation*, that is, the day after the day of preparation for the Sabbath, — which is simply the Sabbath.<sup>1</sup> Some of the Jewish leaders, so Matthew tells us, asked Pilate to station a guard at the tomb, lest the disciples should steal away the body of Jesus and then pretend that he had come to life again, as he had predicted that he should. Pilate's reply is expressed in such a form as to leave it uncertain whether he authorised them to take a guard or merely said that they already had at their command a sufficient police force for their purpose.<sup>2</sup> In either case their object is gained. They go and affix a seal to the stone which closes the mouth of the sepulchre and station a guard.

## § 196. THE EMPTY TOMB.

*Matt. xxviii., 1-10 ; Mark xvi., 1-8 ; Luke xxiv., 1-11 (12).*

Overlooking the differences in the accounts of the evangelists concerning the resurrection of Jesus,<sup>3</sup> there are two facts, and two only, to which they unanimously testify, namely, that on the second morning after the burial certain of the disciples found that the body of their master had disappeared from the tomb, and that many from that time on believed that they themselves or others had again beheld him alive. It is necessary, therefore, before attempting any general view of

<sup>1</sup> Matthew writes as though he had Mark xv., 42, before him.

<sup>2</sup> The former would be more likely to be the case, considering the implications of the following story of the bribing of the soldiers (§ 197).

<sup>3</sup> Upon those details of time, place, and circumstance as to which the Gospels widely differ, neither the opening chapter of Acts nor the Epistles of Paul shed any light.

the subject, to examine the testimony of the Gospels separately. Matthew relates that at early dawn of the morning following the Sabbath two women went to visit the sepulchre and were told by a resplendent angel whom they found there that Jesus had *risen* as he had said that he should, and was going into Galilee, where they would see him. Hurrying away to carry the news to the disciples, they met Jesus himself, who said to them, *Fear not go tell my brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me.* The earthquake and the rolling away of the stone by the angel, of which Matthew speaks, seem to have preceded the arrival of the women, although here the narrative is not lucid. Mark adds one to the number of the women, and apparently makes the visit to have been a little later in the morning. He knows nothing of any angelophany, but speaks of the women finding in the open tomb a young man in a white robe, who said to them substantially that which Matthew ascribes to his angel. Neither does Mark know that the women met Jesus. Luke, too, speaks of an early visit to the tomb by three women, but he differs from Mark with regard to the name of the third, in place of one young man speaks of two men, and, according to him, the women made full report of what they had seen, while Mark says that they said nothing to anybody. Luke also speaks of other women who carried the news to the apostles but whose testimony was not believed by them. Then Peter visits the tomb, sees the linen cloths lying there, and goes home wondering at what has happened. Of the women mentioned by the other evangelists John speaks of but one—Mary Magdalene, who tells Peter and “the disciple whom Jesus loved,” both of whom hasten to the tomb. Neither Luke nor John says anything about instructions to the disciples to go into Galilee for the purpose of meeting Jesus; and John does not speak of anyone, either man or angel, being found in the tomb at first, although he says that Mary

a little later saw there "two angels in white sitting, one at the head and one at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain," and that they entered into conversation with her. Then follows the statement that she turned and saw Jesus standing there, but thought it was the gardener, and did not recognise him until he had twice spoken to her. Then he commissioned her to go and tell the disciples that he is about to ascend to the Father.<sup>1</sup> Such is the account of the events of the first Easter morning as given by the four evangelists. In place of all this Paul<sup>2</sup> has the simple statement that Jesus "appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve."

# § 197. THE SCHEME OF THE CHIEF-PRIESTS.

*Matt. xxviii., 11-15.*

On the day of the discovery that the tomb is empty some of the guards, according to Matthew, go into the city and report the fact, with all its accompaniments, to the chief-priests. The members of the Sanhedrin are assembled, and, as a result of their consultation, the guards are bribed to circulate the report that while they were asleep the body of Jesus was stolen by some of his disciples (*a*).

## NOTE.

(*a*, p. 319) The whole story about the watch, including the contents of § 195, must be looked upon with suspicion. Since, as already intimated, the historical character of the definite predictions by Jesus of his resurrection on the third day cannot well be maintained, the reason assigned for the stationing of a guard at the tomb must be considered to rest upon a later belief in the fact of the resurrection. The narrative presupposes several incredible things, namely, that the chief-priests really knew of such a prediction by Jesus as they are said to have ascribed to him, that they believed in its actual fulfilment, and yet, though persuaded that Jesus had returned to

<sup>1</sup> For John's narrative see xx., 1-18.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. xv., 5.

life, bribed the guard to circulate a false report, which, if it came to the ears of the Roman authorities, was likely to prove fatal to those who told the story,—for it meant death to a Roman soldier to allow himself to fall asleep upon his post, and no influence of the Jewish ecclesiastics could be depended upon to interfere successfully with the discipline of a Roman cohort. That this account does not belong to the oldest stratum of Christian tradition is evidenced by its absence from Mark's narrative as well as by the statement of Matthew that this story had continued to be current among the Jews up to the time of his writing—which implies that the event was somewhat remote. We see here an effort to account for the unbelief of the Jews in the fact of the resurrection, the evidence for which had come at the time of the Gospel writing to be looked upon in Christian circles as altogether conclusive.

#### § 198. THE WALK TO EMMAUS.

*Luke xxiv., 13-35.*

According to Luke, Jesus neither himself goes into Galilee nor sends his disciples thither, but, on the contrary, enjoins upon them to remain in Jerusalem. On the evening of the resurrection-day he is finally separated from them after having been seen since morning by several of his disciples. First of all he is met by two who are on their way to Emmaus, a little village a few miles from Jerusalem, but is not recognised until, after having accompanied them home, he is breaking bread with them,—and then he mysteriously vanishes out of their sight. They return at once to the city and tell the apostles and those with them that they have seen Jesus (*a*).

#### NOTE.

(*a*, p. 320) There are features of this story which are best ascribed to the reflective imagination of a later time. When, in spite of the sudden close of the earthly career of Jesus, his disciples had come to look forward with confidence to the time

when he should return to assume the Messiahship, it was necessary that the temporary defeat of their master should be shown to be in accordance with the teachings of prophecy. It was felt that their previous conception of "the coming one" had been erroneous and that they should have known that the Scriptures had spoken of a suffering as well as a conquering Messiah. From this state of mind it would be an easy step to the conviction that Jesus himself after his resurrection had taken advantage of an early opportunity to correct their false notions on this point and to rightly interpret to them the words of the prophets. But in those discourses in which he is said by the evangelists to have predicted his sufferings and death there is no indication of such an understanding of Old Testament prophecy as is here ascribed to him.

#### § 199. JESUS AGAIN IN JERUSALEM.

*Luke xxiv., 36-49.*

Even while the little company of disciples is listening to the story of those who have just come from Emmaus and in turn relating to them the experience of Peter at the tomb, Jesus suddenly appears in their midst. In order to reassure them,—for they are frightened and think that they see a ghost,—he asks them to observe his hands and his feet lacerated by the crucifixion and to satisfy themselves by touching him that he has a substantial body and is no disembodied spirit. Then, since they still disbelieve, he asks for food and partakes of it in their presence, thus giving indisputable proof that he is not a ghost.<sup>1</sup> The second paragraph repeats in fuller form the contents of verses 26, 27.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> John (xx., 19-23) speaks of this meeting, but with several variations from the account of Luke. He alone (xx., 26-29) mentions another sudden appearing eight days after, when the disciples were sitting with closed doors.

<sup>2</sup> See § 198 (a).

## § 200. LAST APPEARING OF JESUS IN GALILEE.

*Matt. xxviii., 16-20.*

Besides the last paragraph of Matthew, the last chapter of John brings Jesus again into Galilee.<sup>1</sup> Since some of the eleven to whom he there appeared doubted his identity (verse 17), the statement that *they worshipped*<sup>2</sup> *him* cannot be applicable to all (*a*). In verse 15 there is not, as is so commonly supposed, a prescribed baptismal formula, least of all one involving a recognition of trinitarian doctrine.<sup>3</sup> To be baptised "into the name" of anyone is to acknowledge, through the baptismal rite, one's discipleship to the master named (*b*).

## NOTES.

(*a*, p. 322) Some suppose that this paragraph does not describe what happened on a single occasion, but only gives a summary statement of what occurred in the course of several interviews. The words here ascribed to Jesus, like those said to have been spoken by him on the way to Emmaus, cannot be thought of as a verbatim report of what he said, or of a part of what he said, to the disciples at this meeting, but, having no affinity with his previous teachings, rather represent the conceptions of a later time with regard to the nature and extent of his authority.\*

(*b*, p. 322) This usage is well illustrated in Acts viii., 16,

<sup>1</sup> We are not here concerned with the question whether this chapter has the same author as the rest of the Gospel.

<sup>2</sup> See § 3 (*b*), p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> It is, nevertheless, not unlikely that we have here, in the fact that simple discipleship to Jesus is not spoken of and that the Holy Spirit is particularised in addition to the Father, an indication of that development of thought which finally led to the conception of a triune God. The passages quoted under (*b*) show that the earliest preachers of Christianity did not consider themselves bound by a baptismal formula such as is generally supposed to be here prescribed.

\* Cp. 1 Cor. xv., 24, 25.

where certain converts are spoken of as having "been baptised into the name of the Lord Jesus," and in Acts xix., 3, where it is recorded that some who had first been baptised "into John's baptism" were afterwards "baptised into the name of the Lord Jesus," *i. e.*, henceforth recognised themselves as disciples of Jesus. In 1 Cor. i., 13, 15, by baptism "into the name of Paul" is meant a baptism which would have justified the affixing to the converts some name like "Paulists" in recognition of a special relation to the apostle.

### § 201. THE ASCENSION.

*Luke xxiv., 50-53.*

Luke's account of the manner of the final separation of Jesus from his disciples presents no distinct picture of the event. The clauses which seem to give it some degree of precision are of very doubtful genuineness.<sup>1</sup> In its fullest form the narrative cannot be understood otherwise than as intended to describe a bodily ascension to a local heaven, while the bystanders prostrated themselves upon the ground in adoration.

<sup>1</sup> The "some ancient authorities" referred to in the margin of the R. V. are of such importance that the passages in question are bracketed by Westcott and Hort and altogether omitted from the Tisch.-Geb. text. Their omission, if genuine, from so many good MSS. is not easily accounted for, while they are of such a character that their rather early interpolation might almost be expected. If, as is probable, Luke was the author of Acts, his statement in that book (i., 9), "as they were looking he was taken up and a cloud received him out of their sight," may have had its influence in the modification of the text of the related passage in the Gospel. In Acts, however, the ascension does not take place until forty days after the resurrection (i., 3).



## § 202. THE POST-RESURRECTION NARRATIVE IN ANOTHER FORM.

*Mark xvi., 9-20.*

This section of Mark's narrative has the appearance of being an appendix by another hand (*a*). Considerable portions of its contents are found in Luke and John, although there are variations from these sources as well as agreements with them. The words of Jesus at his last meeting with his disciples in Jerusalem are not here reported in the form given to them in Luke. The contents of verses 16-18 are altogether peculiar to the present passage, neither is there any mention elsewhere in the Gospels of the missionary labours described in verse 20.<sup>1</sup>

### NOTE.

(*a*, p. 324) This is the longest passage in the Synoptic Gospels with regard to the genuineness of which there are serious doubts. The manuscript evidence against it is very strong if not conclusive. The "different ending" referred to in the margin of the Revised Version runs thus: "and they reported briefly to Peter and his companions all the injunctions. And after this Jesus himself also sent forth through them from the east even unto the west the sacred and imperishable message of eternal salvation." The mere fact of the existence of these variant endings of the Gospel tells against the genuineness of them both.

That the whole passage is an attempt by a later hand to continue Mark's narrative also appears from evidence furnished by the passage itself. Verse 7, like Matt. xxviii., 7, 10, contemplates a meeting of Jesus with his disciples in Galilee; but in the appended verses the meetings are in and

<sup>1</sup> The important statement of Paul (1 Cor. xv., 5-8) is not to be overlooked,—that, besides other manifestations to individuals, Jesus "appeared to above five hundred brethren at once," most of whom, he says, were alive at the time of his writing, *i. e.*, near the close of the sixth Christian decade.

near Jerusalem, just as in Luke's account. It is to be presumed that, if Mark himself had continued his narrative, he, like Matthew, would have followed the tradition which took Jesus into Galilee. Both in vocabulary and in style the passage is unlike the rest of the Gospel.

Even if it could be established, in opposition to the prevailing judgment of modern criticism, that the passage properly belongs to our canonical Gospel, it would still be incredible that verses 16-18 should have proceeded from the mouth of Jesus, so great is the incongruity between these words and the habitual utterances of his life.

*Review of §§ 198-202.*—It is to be recalled that of the two oldest Gospels the one having the best claim to priority of composition says nothing whatever, except in the probably spurious appendix, of any post-resurrection appearances of Jesus, and that Matthew mentions only an appearing to the two Marys just after they had left the sepulchre on the morning of the first day of the week and a later manifestation to the disciples in Galilee when "some doubted." Now these are precisely the two Gospels with regard to which there is the greatest probability that they rest upon apostolic testimony—a consideration of unusual importance in the present case, since the later post-resurrection appearances are said to have been either to some or to all of the eleven. Especially is it to be noted that, although in the Gospel of Luke Peter is said to have been of the number of those who saw Jesus after the resurrection, and in the account contained in the last chapters of John—the most extended of all the accounts of the meetings of the risen Jesus with his disciples—Peter stands prominently forth, and in him centres the chief interest of the occasion, his master conversing with him freely, Mark, whose Gospel undisputed tradition makes to have been a reproduction of what had been reported by Peter, has nothing to say of all this. It is Luke, the late compiler, and the still later writer of the Fourth Gospel, who testify so fully to events of which their predecessors appear to have known nothing, or nothing which they judged to be worthy of repetition.

As to the general character of their contents it is to be observed that, with the exception of Matt. xxviii., 9, 10, none of the accounts under consideration are free from that vague-

ness and obscurity and that air of mystery which are among the surest signs of the presence of unhistorical elements in a narrative. The visions of angels here described are upon the same plane as those already met with in the birth-stories, and all such representations the best critical judgment places "to the account of the involuntarily poetising legend." Again, it is hard to accept as historical the oft-repeated statement that Jesus was with great difficulty recognised by even his most intimate friends. The two disciples with whom he walked to Emmaus are said to have held an extended conversation with him, and yet they did not even suspect at the time who he was. Mary Magdalene makes the strange mistake of taking him for a gardener. Although at least two of the companions of the twelve had already seen him and talked with him and eaten with him, yet, upon his appearing among them and greeting them with a "Peace be unto you," "they were terrified and supposed that they beheld a spirit." Even when all the apostles, including the doubting Thomas, had been persuaded that Jesus was again alive, even then, on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias, he talks with seven of his disciples, most of whom were of the number of the twelve, and yet they do not know that it is he and only infer it later from the fact that, when they cast their net where he tells them to, they meet with marvellous success. How unreal, too, is, the way in which he comes and goes after the resurrection! He is sitting at table at Emmaus with the two whom he has accompanied home, and all at once he vanishes out of their sight. Three times he appears suddenly and mysteriously among the disciples, twice when the doors have been made secure against the intrusion of unwelcome guests. One moment his body is truly human, the next it is ghost-like. Here is an utter absence of truly historical conditions, indicating that the growth of legend has overloaded with products of the imagination the simple testimony of the primitive Gospel.

*Theories of the Resurrection.*—So much admits of no question,—that the writers of the Gospels represent all but a very few of the friends of Jesus as being persuaded that, after having died upon the cross, he had returned to life. In modern times the supposed grounds of this faith have been set forth in various forms. The obvious and to most persons

satisfactory answer to the question, "Why did the disciples believe?" is that they trusted the evidence of their senses. This answer, however, confuses two very different things—the real testimony of the senses and the inferences drawn therefrom. That Jesus was crucified was a fact of observation; that he died upon the cross is an hypothesis resting upon the two facts that the bystanders no longer observed signs of consciousness and that friends removed his apparently lifeless body and placed it in a tomb. It is a legitimate inquiry whether life was really extinct; and this question must be answered in the affirmative before there can be any room for the hypothesis of a "resurrection from the dead." In the very nature of the case, however, only a high degree of probability and not absolute certainty is attainable,—nor even that degree of certainty which the testimony of modern science could give in a similar case. It must be remembered that the judgment in question was that of men without technical knowledge and without the habit of careful observation.

The probability that the death of Jesus was only apparent and not real has been argued upon the ground that, since crucifixion wrought no injury to any vital part, so that death ordinarily resulted from exhaustion and not from loss of blood, and since the time during which Jesus was upon the cross was not sufficient to produce fatal exhaustion,\* what was supposed by the onlookers to be death was only syncope. The force of this argument is somewhat weakened by the consideration that the removal of one assigned cause of an event does not preclude the possibility of the presence of other real and adequate causes. Thus it has been imagined that the death of Jesus was due to a "broken heart," or to the wound made by the soldier's spear,† or to his voluntarily laying down his life by an act beyond ordinary human power; but the first claim rests upon mere conjecture, for the second the evidence is altogether inadequate,‡ and the third introduces a supernatural element which takes the case

\* See Appendix J. This consideration receives support from Pilate's doubt—Mark xv., 44.

† See John xix., 34.

‡ In the *Unitarian Review*, July, 1887, Art. viii., I have shown why it is inadequate. It is also the judgment of Olshausen, who does not doubt the reality of the death of Jesus, that "the medical proofs . . .

out of the realm of natural law and so removes it altogether from the domain of criticism. The theory of syncope receives considerable support from the frequent well-attested cases of revival from apparent death, as well as from the fact that the signs of death are still in many cases so uncertain that in at least one of the most enlightened European capitals burial is not allowed until after the lapse of a specified time, during which evidences of returning consciousness are constantly watched for. It is safe to accept as a final judgment upon this theory the conclusion of Hase: "It is impossible to demonstrate absolutely the death of Jesus, since there is no certain criterion of death in any case except the commencement of decay, or the destruction of an organ essential to life.

We can only say, according to a universally recognised truth, that the organic principle of the body is not released till the lower powers of decay commence their work. In the case of Jesus this decay of the body had not begun."\* To this may be added the statement of Olshausen, that the fact of the death of Jesus "cannot be demonstrated on external grounds." The theory of resuscitation has room for the following conjectures: that the wealthy and influential Joseph of Arimathea supplied whatever medical attendance was necessary to secure the full and speedy return of Jesus to consciousness; that the body, therefore, was not allowed to remain overnight in the tomb; that after thirty-six hours of rest and watchful care he was able, clothed in such garments as the gardener could furnish, to walk abroad,† when, unexpectedly meeting Mary Magdalene, he hastily withdrew; and that thereupon Joseph secured his speedy removal from his dangerous surroundings to a safe retreat in his native Galilee. With regard to his ultimate fate the theory does not need to concern itself, neither is it

from the wound made by the spear-thrust are at least not irresistible." —*Com. on N. T.*, Am. ed., III., 112.

\* *Life of Jesus*, trans. by James Freeman Clarke, pp. 228, 229. In this connection it is well to recall the distinction made by some medical men between "somatic" and "cellular" death, the former of which leaves room for possible resuscitation.

† This almost necessarily assumes that the feet of Jesus had not been nailed to the cross, and is so far at variance with the belief of the early church as exhibited in Luke xxiv., 40.

materially weakened by the necessity of some supplementary hypothesis to account for the rise of the stories of the other Judæan appearances. Notwithstanding the support which the theory of resuscitation has received from its acceptance by eminent critics in the past,\* it has not at present any considerable number of advocates, and it may be said to be the fashion to speak of it slightly rather than to inquire carefully into its merits. The refusal on the part of many to even consider this theory is apparently and sometimes confessedly motived by an unwillingness to weaken the foundation of that form of the doctrine of the atonement which is bound up with a belief in the death and resurrection of Jesus. Thus Christlieb declares that "this theory is contradicted by the divine and human necessity of Christ's death as the ground of our reconciliation with God"; and he asks, "How could this death, foreshadowed by all the sacrifices of the Old Testament, be imagined as a sacrificial death, if Christ did not actually expire?" It would be easy to quote many other utterances of this sort. It is plainly reasoning in a circle when one of the articles of a creed which is claimed to be drawn from the Bible is brought forward in support of that which is declared to have been its source.

Those who on *a priori* grounds find it impossible to believe in a "resurrection from the dead," at least in the sense in which this phrase is commonly understood, but yet judge that Jesus really died upon the cross, often take refuge in the supposition that the dead body was stealthily removed from the tomb by some of the disciples, as Matthew (xxviii., 15) says that the Jews of his time claimed to have been the case. Variations of this theory assign the removal of the body either to the Roman or the Jewish authorities.

Theories which recognise the reality both of the death and the resurrection of Jesus vary nevertheless in the way in which they conceive of the nature of the resurrection body. Unquestionably, as already observed, the different views which are presented in the Gospels are irreconcilable with one another, so that no one theory can satisfy the conditions of all the accounts. The hypothesis which assumes that the very body which was placed in the tomb was restored to life has no room for the stories of ghostly apparition, while the theory of a spiritual body, such as Paul thinks of, cannot be

\* Among them Schleiermacher and Bunsen.

reconciled with those passages of the Gospels which represent Jesus as again living under ordinary human conditions. To maintain the resurrection of the material body is to assume such a reversal of the laws of nature as does great violence to the modern scientific conception of the stable order of the universe : to speak of a " spiritual body " is to use phraseology which seems to scientist and philosopher alike, unless the latter be of that monistic school which knows no distinction between mind and matter, quite devoid of intelligible meaning.

Another type of theory ascribes the origin of early Christian faith in the resurrection of Jesus to sources altogether subjective. A reviving faith in his Messiahship is conceived to have had sufficient force to give birth to the conviction first that he must return to earth to finish his work and then to the belief that he had actually done so. As the result of this belief many saw visions, which the popular faith soon transmuted into objective realities. This is the so-called " vision-hypothesis." A theory which stands midway between this and the ordinary hypothesis of an objective bodily appearing is that which assumes an occasional supernatural reappearing from the celestial abodes,—an hypothesis acknowledged, however, to be irreconcilable with the letter of the New Testament narrative.

The strongest support of the vision hypothesis in the forms in which it is most commonly held is found in the phenomena of modern Spiritualism. If " expectant attention " can in these days lead thousands to believe that they actually behold in bodily form the spirits of the departed, it is without much difficulty conceivable that, when the idea of the continued life of Jesus had once taken possession of any of the disciples, however few, it would not be long before great numbers would believe that they had had a vision of the risen Christ. What is not quite satisfactorily accounted for under this hypothesis is the starting-point of this belief in the resurrection. Most commonly, to those to whom the influence of a reviving Messianic hope seems insufficient, the testimony of Mary Magdalene as to her personal experience is considered to have been its original source.

With all its generally recognised difficulties the vision-theory in one form or another is at the present day the most commonly accepted explanation, apart from the traditional

hypothesis, of the belief of the early church in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. Whatever theory may be adopted, or if no one of those which have been suggested can be considered satisfactory, the fact remains that with the birth of Christianity there came into the world a development and strengthening of that faith in a future life which before had been the possession of comparatively few.



## ELEMENTS OF TEXT-CRITICISM.

*Outline.*—In the critical study of any literary work of antiquity the first step is to attempt to secure a trustworthy text. By this is meant that the student must, if possible, have an exact copy of the author's work before attempting to enter into his thought. Herein is implied the existence of more or less important differences in different copies,—a fact, in the case of the New Testament, of which the ordinary reader of the common English Bible is seldom aware. All the copies of a modern book appearing in a single printed edition may be absolutely alike in their wording, but no ancient work copied many times in manuscript has had any considerable chance of being preserved in its original purity. This is especially true of the New Testament, the three thousand or more manuscript copies of the whole or of portions of which now extant in the Greek language are but a small part of the number known to have been in existence in the early Christian centuries. It is, then, the province of Textual Criticism to endeavour to free the New Testament text from its corruptions, so far as modern resources render this possible. In the present treatment of the subject the order of procedure will be to consider (1) the causes of variation in MSS., (2) material and helps for the restoration of the text, (3) rules and methods of procedure, (4) results thus far attained.

### *I. Various Readings.*

1. Wherever any two copies of the New Testament differ in any respect, however slight, there is what is technically

called a "various reading." The number of these variations in known manuscripts is too large ever to have been accurately computed ; but whether it amounts to 50,000 or to 150,000 (the latter being the more common estimate at the present time) it is of no practical importance to determine, since in probably more than ninety-nine per cent of the cases the true reading is capable of sufficiently accurate determination, and the essential meaning of a passage is seldom rendered uncertain by the inability of critics to determine what is the true text.

2. The causes of various readings are to be sought chiefly in the conditions under which copies of the Scriptures were produced prior to the appearance in Europe of the art of printing. Nothing whatever is known concerning the fate of the autograph originals of the twenty-seven different compositions which go to make up the New Testament and which must for a long time have existed separately before any one thought of binding them up into a single sheaf. Whatever exact dates are assigned for the composition of the several Gospels, we are compelled to believe that some ten generations of men read the Christian oracles from manuscripts, not a single one of which is now known to be in existence. Who the copyists of these lost manuscripts were we have no means of knowing ; but the presumption is that they were no better fitted for their work than those who came after. There is even good reason for supposing that their qualifications would come far short of equalling those of the studious monks of the later centuries, not only through lack of special training for such a task but also because there was as yet no such unique reverence for the letter of the writings of apostolic and saintly men as to make it a religious duty to preserve their very words. Oral tradition was as yet valued above any written Gospel. The substance of truth was most cared for, and little thought was given to the exact form which it might at any time chance

to wear. The inexactness of the New Testament quotations of the Apostolic Fathers is evidence of this. Thus from the very outset the text of the New Testament writings was exposed to many chances of corruption.

3. When Christianity became the acknowledged religion of the Roman Empire a new impetus was given to the dissemination of the New Testament writings, and copies were then more rapidly multiplied. In this period more pains may have been taken than before to reproduce the exemplar with accuracy ; but a corrupt exemplar could yield only a corrupt copy. The scribe might by happy conjecture be able to correct some of the mistakes of earlier copyists ; but he would probably add at the same time some of his own.

4. " Clerical errors," that is, unintentional departures from an exemplar, might result from various causes. (*a*) If a scribe wrote from dictation, the pronunciation of the reader might be indistinct or otherwise faulty and so misleading. (*b*) The assistant might be imperfectly familiar with the language of the document and in consequence blunder in his reading. (*c*) But however satisfactory the dictation, the copyist might not be competent to correctly interpret it. The ear would not always be a certain guide to the sense. One word would sometimes be mistaken for another of similar sound but different meaning. The *etacism* of the later Greek, that is, the giving of the long *e* sound to several different vowels and diphthongs, made the ear an untrustworthy guide, especially in orthography, to one not altogether familiar with the language both in its written and its spoken form. (*d*) One copying without the assistance of a reader would escape some dangers but would incur other risks and especially that of repetition or omission. A reader who was doing nothing else but read would have little or no difficulty in following closely the text before him, being able to give to it his undivided attention ; while the scribe, when working without assistance, would constantly have to look

back and forth from original to copy and from copy to original at the constant risk of "losing his place," and so introducing confusion into his writing. To mistakes of dittography and haplography (repetition and omission) nothing contributed so much as the *homœoteleuton* or similar ending of different words standing not far apart, which often led to one word's being mistaken for another. There was especial danger of this in the copying of the earliest Greek manuscripts, which were written in letters of uniform style and without any spaces between the words or any diacritic marks of any kind, so that the eye was constantly liable to mistake letters standing in another connection for those last copied. One of the best New Testament manuscripts in existence is said to furnish no fewer than one hundred and fifteen instances of corruption from this source. Such omission or duplication of passages was sometimes noticed afterwards by the copyist himself, who thought to mend matters by putting into the margin what he had omitted or erasing that which he had improperly written a second time. Someone else, using this copy for an exemplar, might insert the marginal passage in a wrong connection, thus making an additional various reading. Since a copyist necessarily attempts to carry in his mind more or less of the text which he is reproducing, the accuracy of his transcript must always depend chiefly upon the tenacity of his verbal memory. An occasional cause of various readings was the different understanding and consequent different extension of abbreviations.

5. Various readings were sometimes the result of well-meant but misdirected efforts to improve the text. The definite purpose might be either to promote the interests of sound doctrine (although, as a matter of fact, very few alterations were ever made for this specific purpose), or to complete one narrative from another, or to make an obscure passage clearer, or to produce harmony between two conflicting accounts, or to improve the rugged New Testament

style, which was for the most part that of the every-day speech of the common people and not that of the polished discourses of the rhetorician. The brief explanatory notes, or "glosses," which readers of manuscripts sometimes placed in the margin, not infrequently found their way into the body of the text where some copyist supposed that they belonged.

6. It was the custom of the Church from very early times to make use of service-books compiled from the New Testament, those containing selections from the Gospels being generally called *evangelistaries*, or "gospel lessons," while those compiled from Acts and the Epistles bore the simple generic name of *lectionaries*, or "reading-lessons." A manuscript of the latter sort is sometimes more exactly styled an *apostolos* or *praxapostolos*. Passages thus taken out of their proper connection often began abruptly and sometimes obscurely. To remedy this defect slight verbal changes were often made and sometimes one or more explanatory words added. In the absence of such service-books a marked manuscript might be used. When these dissected texts came to be employed as helps in the construction of entire copies of some New Testament book or books, these alterations, made for a temporary and special purpose, would often find their way into the reconstructed text and thus be perpetuated.

## II. *Codices.*

7. In the most comprehensive sense of the term any ancient piece of writing in book form is called a "codex"; yet most commonly the name is applied only to a comparatively few of the very oldest New Testament and classical Greek manuscripts. It is evident that the purity of the text of any codex is likely to be in direct proportion to its nearness to the original, since every fresh transcription is almost certain to add new errors to those already existing. From this it naturally follows that the value of a New Testament manuscript depends upon its age. It is, however, only in a

general sense that this is true, since the possibility of certain modifying circumstances have to be taken account of. A copy might be made to-day from the very oldest manuscript in existence, and such copy, if executed with care, would have a textual value approaching that of its exemplar. It would seem, therefore, that the history of a codex needs to be known in order that a true estimate may be formed of its relative worth; but since historical testimony as to the origin of the several ancient manuscripts which have come down to us is altogether lacking, the value of their text actually has to be determined from a study of the documents themselves.

8. Assuming that the most ancient manuscripts are the most valuable, since, at least in the first instance, we have no other test of excellence, it is important to become acquainted at the outset with such of the New Testament codices as, from their age, have the strongest claim upon our attention. The number of those which are of preëminent antiquity is very small; for of all the copies of the Scriptures used prior to the sixth century only four are known to be now in existence, neither have all these been preserved in their completeness. They constitute two couplets, one belonging to the fourth century and the other to the fifth. Since no New Testament manuscript written before the tenth century bears a date, the age of these and other early codices can be determined only by a careful comparative examination of the graphical remains of Greek literature, beginning with the centuries immediately preceding our era.

9. Most of the extant writings of antiquity, excepting some of the very oldest, have been preserved either upon papyrus, parchment, or paper. Skilled palæographers know approximately when the prepared skins of small animals began to take the place of sheets of writing material manufactured from the Egyptian papyrus-plant, and when parchment, in its turn, gave place to paper made of linen or cotton. The first centuries of our era belong to what may be called the

parchment period. The style of writing, even more than the material used, furnishes indications of the age of ancient documents. Ignoring minor distinctions it may be said that the handwriting of the Greeks and Romans was either *uncial* or *cursive*, the former being the style used by the professional scribe or book-maker, and the latter the more hurried and less regular script in every-day use. The former was the square-cornered capital letter of the lapidary modified by the naturally freer movement of the pen, while the latter was the still farther modified business or running hand. Between the two is the *semi-uncial* alphabet, subdivided into *majuscule* and *minuscule*, although these latter terms are sometimes used to distinguish between large letters and small, without regard to differences of style. Apart from the material of manuscripts and the style of handwriting, other subsidiary data are often of much value to the student of palæography. The lack of word-division and of most marks of punctuation in the oldest manuscripts has been already referred to (*I.*, 4). The first indication of a tendency to break up the text into natural divisions is seen in the *stichometry* or "line-measuring" of the older manuscripts. So much of the text was written upon one line as seemed to the writer to have a certain unity. After a time the text was written continuously, as at first, and the stichometrical divisions were indicated by marks of punctuation. Then by degrees various other marks of distinction came into vogue, until at length the complexity of the mediæval style of manuscript was reached.

10. With the increase of the number of known Biblical manuscripts there has arisen a desire to diminish by classification the difficulty attending their use. The attempts thus far made to reduce all codices to a small number of distinct classes has not met with signal success. The only division to which no exception can be taken is into ancient and modern—a distinction too vague to be of very much practical value. If any other separation than this is to be recognised,

it should perhaps be into Western, Alexandrian, and Syrian. The basis of such classification is the similarity of the peculiar readings of the different manuscripts, indicating some sort of relationship,—just as the peculiar features of individuals sometimes point out the family to which they belong. The blending of texts, however, like the intermarriage of individuals of different national stocks, soon obscures family traits and makes it impossible to say to what class any given codex should be assigned.

11. Besides bearing descriptive titles, manuscripts are designated, for convenience of reference, either by letters or numbers. Capital letters—Roman, Greek, and Hebrew—are reserved for the uncials. The four oldest New Testament codices above referred to are the following :

Σ (*Aleph*), or the Sinaitic (also called the Petersburg) manuscript, found in a monastery on Mt. Sinai, but now in St. Petersburg. It dates from the fourth century, and contains the New Testament entire.

A, or the Alexandrian manuscript, so called from the supposed place of its origin : now in the British Museum in London. It belongs to the fifth century, and contains all the books of the New Testament, though imperfect in parts. It, as well as Σ, comprises some books no longer recognised as canonical.

B, or the Vatican manuscript, belonging to the papal library at Rome. It is generally thought to be of about the same age as Σ, although some contend that it is older. It contains the greater part of the New Testament.

C, or the Ephraem Rescript, a palimpsest belonging to the National Library in Paris. It derives its name from the fact that in the twelfth century works of Ephraem the Syrian were written upon the parchment, which had been cleansed for their reception.\* Chemical skill has now made the original writing once more visible. The manuscript is of the fifth century and contains considerable fragments of all the New Testament books but two.

\* Such manuscripts are called “palimpsests” or “rescripts.”



Next in rank to these four great Bibles, in the judgment of most, stands

D, or the Cambridge manuscript, also known as the Codex Bezae, having been presented to the University of Cambridge, England, by the monk Theodore Beza. It dates from the sixth century and contains the Gospels and Acts, but with some portions lacking.

These five manuscripts have all been published either in facsimile or in modern type.

### III. Versions.

12. Since from a translation an inference can be drawn as to the reading of the original, ancient versions of the New Testament are of value as indicating what text was in the hands of the translator. Thus there can be no doubt that a Latin version which, in John i., 18, has *unigenitus filius* and not *u. deus* (*i. e.*, "only-begotten son," and not "only-begotten God") rests upon a text having *υἱός* and not *θεός*. In case, however, a version has a reading which could not have been derived from any known Greek text, the inference to be drawn is not necessarily that some lost manuscript had a corresponding reading; for such peculiarity of rendering may have been due to a blunder on the part of the translator. Especial care needs to be exercised in using the versions, since it is well known that some of their texts have been altered to make them conform to later Greek exemplars. Moreover, manuscripts of versions have been exposed to the same chances of corruption as manuscripts of the original, and so need to be carefully edited before they can properly be used as authorities. The fitness of the language of the version for the exact rendering of Greek has also to be considered, as well as the qualifications of the individual interpreter as manifested in the general characteristics of his work. Versions made from other versions are almost necessarily of inferior value.

13. Ten ancient versions are recognised as being of more or less value to the student of the Greek text : (1) Syriac, (2) Egyptian, (3) Ethiopic, (4) Armenian, (5) Georgian, (6) Persian, (7) Arabic, (8) Latin, (9) Gothic, (10) Slavonic. The versions of the eastern group (1-7), like those of the western (8-10), are of unequal merit, (1), (2), (3), and (8) being the only ones which have furnished valuable materials for text-criticism.

14. As was to be expected from the proximity of Syria to Palestine, translations of the New Testament into Syriac appeared at a very early date. The speedy diffusion of Christianity throughout the regions lying farther west and south led also to the early rendering of the Scriptures into the Latin tongue and soon after into the native dialects of northern Africa. There is direct historical evidence to the existence of the New Testament in Syriac as early as the middle of the third century. Most of the leading scholars of the present day incline strongly to the belief that the second century is not too early a date to assign to the first Syriac translations. It has been conjectured that different books were translated by different persons. From the oldest Syriac version five of the books now included in our canon—2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and the Apocalypse—appear to have been wanting, although some have thought that they were originally present and afterwards dropped out. This version has come down to us, or rather, considering the fragmentary condition of most of the texts, may be said to be known to us, in four forms, styled the Curetonian, the Jerusalem, the Peshitto (Peshito, or Peshita), and the Philoxenian. The first-named text exists in considerable fragments discovered by Dr. Cureton in a volume which came into the possession of the British Museum in 1842, in three leaves in the Royal Oriental Library in Berlin, and almost entire in a palimpsest discovered in 1892 in the same monastery where **8** was found. Although there is still some difference of opinion upon the

point, the Curetonian text is now considered by the great majority of critics to be nearer than any other to the original form of the version. Among German scholars, Balthgen is distinguished by his maintenance of the position that the Diatessaron of Tatian was the parent of all Syriac versions of the Gospels. In the midst of the uncertainty which still hangs about the origin of the first Latin versions, it is sufficient here to say that the preponderance of present opinion seems to be in favour of recognising a translation made in northern Africa during the second century as the basis of the versions which appeared later in the countries of southern Europe. What used to be spoken of as the "Itala," but is now called the "Old Latin," version is probably this African version in its earliest unimproved form, although some hold that there were original European Latin versions made quite independently of the African. Jerome's revision of the existing translations speedily supplanted all other forms of the Latin text and was not long in developing into the "Vulgate," to this day the authoritative form of Scripture for the Roman Catholic Church. By the middle of the third century, if not before the end of the second, Egypt had a version of the New Testament which has been preserved in no fewer than three dialects of the Coptic vernacular—the Memphitic, Thebaic, and Bashmuric. The Ethiopic version appeared somewhat later, probably between the fourth and sixth centuries. The Armenian version belongs to the fifth century. Such value as it has is due to the fact of its being a translation from Greek originals. The remaining versions are not of sufficient importance to be here dwelt upon.

#### *IV Patristic Quotations.*

15. Quotations from the New Testament abound in many of the Church Fathers. Where these writings are of early date they are often of no small value in lending confirmation

to readings found in existing manuscripts of the New Testament text. The Apostolic Fathers, however, for some reason, probably because they were so near to the traditional oral sources of the Gospel that they had little reason for following strictly documents which did not yet stand in the place of authority now occupied by them, often quote with the greatest freedom, as though the essential meaning and not the exact form of the passage were of consequence. It is sometimes even doubtful whether they are quoting our Scriptures at all and not rather some document now lost. Then again, we have not their writings free from corruption, so that the real nature of their testimony is sometimes uncertain ; for there have been, of course, in all ages the same liability to error in copying the works of the Fathers as in copying the Scriptures themselves. Besides, who can guarantee the original accuracy of all the citations made by any author ? With all these limitations the central fact still remains that, when an ecclesiastical writer repeatedly cites one and the same passage in exactly the same form, and especially if the passage is of considerable length, there is a reasonable presumption that he had at hand, or at least was familiar with, a manuscript having the very reading which he gives. Sometimes a writer even makes a definite statement to this effect. The Fathers who flourished before the time of the writing of *8* and *B* give, in the passages which they quote, what are virtually fragments of older manuscripts.

16. All Church Fathers, even of the post-apostolic time, are not of equal value for purposes of text-criticism. Some habitually quote more loosely than others. The homilist does not, like the controversialist, feel the need of confining himself to the exact language of Scripture, while the commentator naturally cites the very words the meaning of which he is expounding. The silence of a controversial writer may even be significant, since his failure to quote an important passage which would be to his purpose may be taken as an

indication that it was not known to him ; though here as elsewhere such evidence is only confirmatory of the testimony of existing codices and has value merely as tending to show that there were other manuscripts now lost from which the passage in question was absent. Thus the fact that no ecclesiastical writers excepting one in the fifteenth and one in the sixteenth century have 1 John v., 7, adds strong confirmation to the evidence furnished by all the older manuscripts that the passage is an interpolation. From such concurrent testimony of manuscripts and Fathers, especially when confirmed by the versions, there can be no appeal.

#### V *Laws of Text-Criticism.*

17. Out of the experience of those who have devoted themselves to the study of the New Testament and other texts during the last two centuries there has been developed a code of critical principles the main features of which may be formulated as follows : (1) The substance of the text must be taken from the oldest manuscripts, and where the five best uncials, or a majority of them (including either B or  $\aleph$ ) and of the oldest versions agree, no appeal is to be taken to codices of a later date\* ; (2) and where the testimony of the oldest and best manuscripts is conflicting, the preference is to be given to readings which have a variety of early attestations, including codices, versions, and Fathers.

18. These two rules of "external evidence," *i. e.*, evidence consisting in the testimony of authorities, are supplemented by considerations drawn from the peculiar characteristics of the readings themselves, and their probable causes in each case. This latter is called "internal evidence," and is capable of subdivision into "intrinsic" and "transcriptional." Intrinsic probability is probability that the author would or would not have written in a certain way. This

\* But  $\aleph$  and B together may sometimes be plainly wrong, as in reading *ἐξ, to*, instead of *ἐξ, from*, in Acts xii., 25.

probability may rest upon supposed knowledge of his habits of thought or speech, from which it is assumed that he is not likely to have departed in the case in question. (*a*) A general standard of probability is that every author will write both good sense and good grammar ; but this cannot be set up as a universal test of the genuineness of a reading. (*b*) The textual value of a reading may be judged by its degree of conformity to the usual style of the author ; but here the subjectivity of the critic is often a misleading element, making it necessary to use this test with extreme caution and in subordination to other more trustworthy evidence. (*c*) Inferences based upon the agreement or disagreement of a reading with the usual vocabulary of an author have also a merely secondary value, since it is hardly to be assumed that an author never varies his forms of speech. Transcriptional evidence is generally of more value, resting as it does upon ample knowledge of the usual mode of procedure of copyists and the various kinds of error to which they are liable. Transcriptional probability is the probability that a given reading has or has not been derived from a certain other reading. Therefore (*d*) a reading to be accepted as probably genuine must be one from which all other rival readings are capable of easy derivation, but which could not itself have been readily derived from any one of them. Here we have the corollary (*e*), that in general the shorter of two readings is more likely to be the genuine one, since it is the rule that repetition tends to result in expansion. It must be recognised, however, that in particular cases the order may have been just the reverse of this. It is a second corollary (*f*) of this rule that a more difficult reading is generally to be preferred to an easier one, since the latter is commonly explicable on the ground of the natural inclination of copyists to attempt to make plain that which seemed to them obscure. Still a third corollary (*g*) is that inelegant expressions are likely to have been forced to give place to those which are

more elegant, rather than the reverse. (*h*) Peculiar readings are to be held in suspicion, since it is always more likely that they are the result of corruption than that, though genuine, they have disappeared from all but a single manuscript. (*i*) In parallel passages differences are more likely to be original than agreements, since there has always been a marked tendency in copyists to try to harmonise discrepancies. Doubtless such changes were also frequently made unconsciously. Instances of this harmonising process are naturally most common in the text of the Synoptic Gospels. (*j*) If of alternative readings one is more in harmony than the other with the probable theological or ethical opinion of the copyist, the evidence for and against it should be scrutinised with especial care. All rules of internal evidence are subject to this limitation, that no reading, however attractive it may be in itself, is to be admitted into the text unless it has some manuscript support.

#### *VI. Editions of the Greek New Testament.*

19. Prior to the invention of the art of printing there had seldom if ever been issued an "edition" of the Scriptures, in the modern sense of that term. Even if an effort was sometimes made to produce several identical copies of a favourite manuscript, or of a text made up from more than one manuscript, the effort could never be fully successful because of the moral certainty that some variations would be unconsciously introduced by the copyists. Although the first printed editions were not copies of a single manuscript, they had no proper claim to be considered critical, so little care was exercised in the construction of their text.

20. The Greek New Testament was first printed entire as a part of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible, which was published at Complutum (the Latin name for the Spanish town of Alcalá) in 1520, after having remained several years in print awaiting the papal sanction for its issue. This edition was

the joint work of several editors and was based upon such manuscripts as had been collected in the university library at Alcalá. The delay in the publication of the Complutensian Polyglot furnished to an enterprising publisher of Basle, in Switzerland, an opportunity to anticipate its issue by putting forth in 1516 an edition of the New Testament hastily prepared by Erasmus, the most distinguished scholar of the time. This edition is of special interest to us as having been the lineal ancestor of the "Received" Greek text. Neither the Complutensian nor the Erasmusian text was based upon any ancient and valuable manuscripts. Even of the few to which he had access Erasmus made no thorough collation. In parts they were imperfect, and of the Apocalypse he had but a single copy, in which, several of the last verses being wanting, he supplied the defect by himself translating the missing portion into Greek from the Latin Vulgate. Thus it has come to pass that there are certain small portions of the Apocalypse, as it stands in the Received Text, which were written by Erasmus and not by the author of the book. Erasmus considerably improved his text in later editions, of which he lived to publish no fewer than four, the last two, however, being nearly identical. The editions of Beza, Robert Stephens, and the Elzevirs are the only others of this period which need here be spoken of. Their importance for us consists in the fact that their texts are closely related to each other and to that of Erasmus, and that the two latter are still constantly referred to as the Received Text, long after they have ceased to be recognised by scholars as a legitimate standard. These are the texts which were chiefly made use of by the editors of our "Authorised" English Version. As a text this version can, of course, have no greater value than the original upon which it is based.\*

\* The text of the Revised Version has been brought into substantial harmony with that of the best critical editions. Its corrected readings have been estimated by one of the Revisers at more than 2000.



21. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries contributed more to the progress of the textual criticism of the New Testament through their collections of various readings, which were now assuming large proportions and which have made possible the truly valuable editions of the last hundred years, than by any important constructive work. The toilers at this task, notwithstanding the value of their services, cannot here receive individual mention. Toward the end of the eighteenth century a really eminent critical editor appears, this time a German, J. J. Griesbach. With him begins a new era in textual criticism, and not until after his death (1812) is anyone else to be thought of as being a true leader in this field. In sobriety of judgment he has hardly since had an equal, certainly not a superior. It is because of more recent discoveries of valuable manuscripts and the more complete collation of those which were known to him that later critics have been able to improve materially upon his text. His classification of manuscripts as Byzantine, Alexandrian, and Western is substantially that of some of the most eminent critics of the present day.

22. The earliest notable edition of the nineteenth century (after Griesbach's last, which appeared in the first decade) is that of Lachmann, issued in 1831, and improved in some of its later editions by the aid of Philip Buttmann (1842 and 1850). Buttmann had no other end in view than to restore the text of the fourth century, without regard to the errors which had crept into it before that time. He consequently made use of very few manuscripts and seldom of any but those which he considered as belonging to the "Eastern" family. The limits which he thus imposed upon himself, and which he would have imposed upon others, considering greater freedom to be dangerous, prevented him from constructing a text having preëminent value, although the stress which he laid upon the necessity of depending wholly upon external testimony and that only of the most ancient

authorities was a healthy tonic for those who were inclined to accept all sorts of testimony without discrimination and to make an over-free use of internal evidence.

23. Notwithstanding the merely provisional character of Lachmann's text, due to his disregard of the often valuable testimony of comparatively late manuscripts, it is of interest to note that his method gave for the most part the same results as have been reached by later editors who have made use of a much wider range of authorities. Thus Tregelles, coming not many years later (b. 1813, d. 1875), and working upon a more comprehensive plan, and with a largely increased store of various readings, produced a text whose general colouring is to a considerable extent like that of Lachmann's last edition. With his name is to be coupled that of one whose fame is much more widely spread because of the greater variety and extent of his labours — A. F. C. Tischendorf (1815–1874). Simply as a textual critic it is doubtful if Tregelles was in any way inferior to Tischendorf, and in steadiness and impartiality of judgment he may even be said to have been his superior.

24. Tischendorf's whole life was devoted to textual studies. No sooner had he become a licentiate in theology (1840) than he offered to the public the first-fruits of his learning in the form of an edition of the Greek New Testament. Thereafter by extensive travels he became personally familiar with the contents of the most valuable manuscripts, so far as these were accessible, and was not long in becoming one of the most distinguished paleographers of Europe. The details of his life and labours cannot here be traced ; but his discovery of the Codex  $\aleph$  was an event of such importance as to deserve special mention. While upon a visit to the convent of St. Catharine, on Mt. Sinai, in 1844, he saw and came into possession of several leaves of this manuscript, the whole of which, when discovered by him several years later (1859), was, through his efforts, presented to the Czar of Russia (the

head of the Greek Church, to which the convent belongs), at whose expense it was published under the direction of the fortunate discoverer. In his last edition of the New Testament text (1869 and 1872) Tischendorf showed a partiality for the readings of the newly discovered manuscript which has not been shared by later editors, most of whom have placed an equal if not a higher value upon the Vatican Codex. Gebhardt's edition of Tischendorf's text is the one at present most prized : it is the one used by Holtzmann as the basis of his *Hand-Commentar*.

25. Both in England and America and increasingly in Germany the text of Westcott and Hort (1st ed., 1881) is becoming the standard. The editors announce that their text, "in that larger sense of the word 'text' which includes the margin, rests exclusively on direct ancient authority of the highest kind." They have not, however, scorned inferior evidence in their effort "to obtain at once the closest possible approximation to the apostolic text itself." The Greek text followed by the Revisers of the Authorised English Version, published also in 1881, does not differ essentially from that of Westcott and Hort ; neither have later editors (for instance J. M. S. Baljon, who published an excellent manual edition in 1898) done much more than follow in the track of these leaders, the great value of whose text is recognised even by those who are not prepared to accept all the critical theories of its editors.

## APPENDIX.

### *A.—The Messianic Hope.*

THE root of the Messianic idea is to be found in the relations which, in the Old Testament, Jehovah is represented as sustaining to His chosen people. The promise which He made to the Israelites while they were still in the land of Egypt, "I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God,"<sup>1</sup> had been conditioned upon their faithfulness to the Divine commands; yet their repeated unfaithfulness, although it brought upon them the Divine displeasure and grievous chastisement, so that sometimes the nation seemed to be upon the brink of destruction, did not permanently alienate from them the good-will of Jehovah, who, through His prophets, declared that He would "make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah,"<sup>2</sup> in place of that which they had violated. Often did the prophets dwell upon the blessedness of the coming time, when the national prosperity should be restored and even multiplied a hundredfold. Jehovah Himself would be the direct author of these blessings, which would include a wondrously increased fertility of lands and flocks and herds, as well as freedom from the hand of the oppressor. If sometimes all this was represented as coming to pass under the leadership of an anointed king, a *messiah*,<sup>3</sup> yet he was only the viceregent of Jehovah, intrusted with the execution of His will. Since most of the prophets who saw in vision this "good time coming" belonged to the southern kingdom, it was natural that the king whom they expected should often be thought of as springing from Davidic stock—as being a "son of

<sup>1</sup> Ex. vi., 7.

<sup>2</sup> Jer. xxxi., 31. Cp. Micah. vii., 18-20.

<sup>3</sup> Not *the* Messiah, for Messianic functions might be discharged by different persons at different times, and, in the Divine providence, even by heathen rulers: see Is. xlv., 1, where Cyrus is spoken of as Messiah.

David." And not only would the Messiah rule over the people of Israel a second time freed from servitude in foreign lands,<sup>1</sup> but heathen nations would come to know Jehovah and to worship in His temple ; for the Lord of hosts would have " blessed them, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance." <sup>2</sup> All lands would bring their tribute to Jerusalem, and so glorious would this " holy mountain " become that there would be as it were new heavens and a new earth.<sup>3</sup> To these constant features of the national hope the later prophets and those apocalyptic seers whose visions form no part of our Scriptures added predictions of a coming day of judgment. The relation of this grand assize to the appearing of the Messiah is variously represented ; but, whenever it shall take place, it is Jehovah and not the Messiah who is to be the judge. On the contrary the Messianic judgment of the New Testament is intrusted to " the Son of Man." <sup>4</sup> The connection between the elder Scripture and the books of the New Testament is made, for the history of the Messianic idea, by " The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach " (Ecclesiasticus), " The Book of Enoch," " The Sybilline Oracles," " The Psalter of Solomon," " The Assumption of Moses," and " The Book of Jubilees." In this literature we trace many fluctuations of thought and feeling, in the midst of which the idea of the coming of a personal Messiah often disappears altogether from sight ; but the fundamental conception of a future golden age for the saints of the Most High, and of a final world-kingdom of righteousness, is ever present.

*References.*—Carpenter, *L. P.*, ch. vi., *First Three Gospels*, ch. iv.; Schürer, II., ii., 126–187; Réville, I., 175–201; W. Robertson Smith, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*; Cone, *Gospel Criticism*, 256–263; James Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*; Colani, *Jésus-Christ et les Croyances Messianiques de son temps*, 2d ed.; Charles A. Briggs, *The Messiah of the Gospels*; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, i., 314; M. Seidel, *In the Time of Jesus*, 147; Hausrath, ii., 191, Eng. tr.

### B.—Quotations from the Old Testament.

Not only is the New Testament as a whole incapable of being rightly understood by him who is unacquainted with the books of the Old Covenant, but the careful student of the Synoptic Gospels in particular is constantly meeting with evidence of a close logical and

<sup>1</sup> See Is. lxvi., 20.

<sup>3</sup> Is. lxvi., 20, 22.

<sup>2</sup> Is. xix., 25.

<sup>4</sup> See Matt. xxv., 31.

literary relation between them and certain portions of the elder Scripture. The Law and the Prophets are cited by the writers of the New Testament altogether in accordance with the rabbinical usage of their times. There being as yet no science of hermeneutics, no restraint was placed upon the freedom of interpretation by any rules of sound procedure such as ordinarily control the exegesis of the present day. Under these conditions it was almost inevitable that the Old Testament should often be used by the writers of the New in an altogether arbitrary fashion. With the abandonment of the theory of the plenary verbal inspiration of the Scriptures it ceases to be necessary to defend the exegetical procedure of Matthew and the rest when it is at variance with the assured results of modern critical inquiry.

When it is said by an evangelist that something in the life of Jesus happened in order that there might be a fulfilment,<sup>1</sup> or that in its happening there was a fulfilment,<sup>2</sup> of something which had been announced beforehand by seer or prophet of the Old Dispensation, it is for us a legitimate inquiry whether the passage cited or referred to was rightly understood and fitly used. A few generations since it was the habit of some, who perceived that in certain cases the Old Testament passage in its original setting evidently had not the meaning which seemed to have been ascribed to it by a New Testament writer, to resort to the fiction that there had been no pretence of interpreting the passage, but that the use intended was nothing more than to parallel the New Testament event with the Old Testament record. This theory of "accommodation" made the Old Testament contribute much to the rhetorical form of the New Testament writings, but ignored the real purpose of the citations in question, which was to establish faith in Christianity upon the basis of Old Testament prophecy and not merely to illustrate from that source some of its features.

When the early followers of Jesus had come to believe in him as the expected Messiah, nothing could be more natural than that they should apply to him not only those passages of the Old Testament which the religious teachers of the Jews had been accustomed to look upon as Messianic, but any others which could by any possibility be supposed to have this character. Even centuries afterward prominent exegetes were not lacking in the Christian Church who distinctly maintained that Scripture meant anything which it could be made to

<sup>1</sup> ἵνα (or ὅπως) πληρωθῇ.

<sup>2</sup> τότε ἐπληρώθη.

mean. Modern scholarship, on the other hand, rests firmly upon this foundation,—the recognition of the fact that no author ever means more than one thing by what he says, and that, when we have once determined this meaning, all other senses are inevitably excluded. To say that a passage has two or more meanings is virtually to say that it is without meaning. It follows, therefore, that if any passage of the Old Testament, interpreted according to the canons of the modern historico-critical method, has a definite relation to the time in which and the circumstances under which it was written, it cannot also refer to persons who lived and events which took place many centuries later.

The particular form of the Old Testament with which the writers of the Gospels were familiar can be determined only approximately. Since at the time of their writing Hebrew had become a dead language, it is not likely that comparatively unlettered men, such as they were, could read the ancient Scriptures in their original tongue. We know that at the time of the composition of the Gospels the Greek Septuagint version of the Old Testament had been in use for two centuries or more among Greek-speaking Jews. That there existed also an oral and possibly a written Aramaic version, that is, a version in the Palestinian vernacular, is a fair inference from a large number of undisputed facts. A thorough examination of their quotations seems to place it beyond reasonable doubt that the Synoptic writers seldom if ever made use of the Hebrew form of Scripture but for the most part, either directly or indirectly, of one of the two versions above referred to. It is not to be supposed that they always quoted from a manuscript, even where one existed; for then as now, and even much more than now, the retentive memories of men unfamiliar with books would be adequate to the reproduction of many scriptures which had been repeatedly listened to at the stated synagogue-service and in the schools of the rabbis.

In the entire N. T. there are 250 or more quotations. The 152 of the Synoptics are distributed as follows: Matthew 68, Mark 32, Luke 52. Matthew's sources seem to have been Aramaic, while Mark and Luke generally agree with the text of the LXX.

*References.*—Toy, *Quot. in N. T.*, Introduction; Cone, *Gospel Criticism*, ch. x.; J. G. Palfrey, *The Relation between Judaism and Christianity*.

*C.—The Herod Family.*

The royal line of the Herods, seven members of which appear in the Synoptic Gospels, was the immediate successor of that Asmonæan or Maccabæan family which had freed Judæa from the Syrian yoke. The founder of the dynasty was Antipater the Idumæan, who, when Judæa fell into the hands of the Romans, so ingratiated himself with the conquerors as to be made a Roman citizen and allowed a large share in the government of the country. He was even able to secure the appointment of his two sons to posts of honour, the younger, Herod, the first of the name, receiving the governorship of Galilee. It is this younger son who is known in history as "Herod the Great."

*I. Herod the Great (Mt. ii., 1 ff.; Luke i., 5).*—From the very beginning of his public career, upon which he entered at an unusually early age, Herod evinced the possession of remarkable executive ability. The Roman government, appreciating his unusual gifts, early promoted him to the governorship of Cœle-Syria (about B.C. 47), and not long after (B.C. 40), made him king of Judæa. The actual possession of his throne, however, was secured only by conquest, and even Jerusalem had to be taken by storm, with the help of Roman arms. This was in B.C. 38 or 37. It required twelve years of constant struggle to establish his dominion upon secure foundations. Then followed twelve years of comparative peace and quiet, succeeded by a period of domestic storms ending only with his death in B.C. 4. The splendour of the middle portion of his reign was tarnished by the oppression and violence which characterised its later days.

*II. Archelaus (Mt. ii., 22).*—Upon the death of Herod the Great each of his three sons, Archelaus, Antipas, and Philip, was desirous of acquiring for himself his father's throne, and each hastened to plead his case before the Roman emperor, with whom rather than with the people of Palestine the decision practically rested. Augustus, disregarding the protests which were made against the appointment of any member of the hated Idumæan family, carried out substantially, but with some variations, the will of Herod, according to which Archelaus was to be his father's successor. By the decision of the emperor Archelaus received as his domain, besides his ancestral Idumæa, all of Judæa and Samaria excepting three cities. This was the richest portion of the dominion of Herod. After a reign of nine years, not with the title of "king" but of "ethnarch," he was deposed by the Roman government because of his flagrant misrule.

*III. Herod Antipas (Mt. xiv., 1 ff.; Mk. vi., 14 ff., viii., 15;*



*Lk. iii., 1 ff., viii., 3, ix., 7, 9, xiii., 31, xviii., 7 ff.*).—To Antipas was given, together with the title of tetrarch, the government of Galilee and Peræa. His reign, which lasted for thirty-five years, was in many respects not unlike that of his father, although distinguished not so much for the ability of the sovereign as for his skill in what in modern times would be called "diplomacy," and for his indulgence of luxurious tastes, especially in the erection of magnificent buildings in his new capital of Tiberias.

*IV Philip the Tetrarch (Lk. iii., 1).*—The third portion of the domain of Herod the Great, which fell to the lot of Philip, consisted of outlying districts, of comparatively little importance although of considerable extent, situated east of the Jordan and stretching from beyond the sources of the river on the north indefinitely southward. He ruled with moderation and justice for a period of thirty or more years.

*V. Herod Philip (Mt. xiv., 3; Mk. vi., 17; Lk. iii., 19).*—This Herod was the son of Herod the Great and Mariamne the daughter of the high-priest Simon.

*VI. Herodias (Mt. xiv., 3, 6; Mk. vi., 17 ff., Lk. iii., 19).*—Two women of the Herod family, mother and daughter, are referred to by the Synoptics. Herodias was granddaughter, on the father's side, of Herod the Great and Mariamne, and, on the mother's side, of Salome, Herod's sister.

*VII. Salome (Mt. xiv., 3, 6; Mk. vi., 22 ff.).*—That the name of that daughter of Herodias who figures so unenviably in the Gospel history was Salome is learned from Josephus<sup>1</sup> and not from the evangelists. Her father as well as her mother was of Herodian stock.

*References.*—Schürer, I., i., 383, ii., 43; Ernest Renan's *History of the People of Israel*, Book X., ch. v.-ix.; Réville, i., 202; Hausrath, i., 205, Eng. tr.; Smith's *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Mythology*; *B.D.D.*

#### *D.—Scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes.*

In the early period of the history of the people of Israel the priest was also a religious teacher. It was not until Judaism became burdened with an elaborate code of ritual and ceremonial observances that a separate class of expositors arose, who devoted themselves wholly to the study and interpretation of the law. These are the

<sup>1</sup> *Antiq.*, xviii., 5, 4.

"scribes" of the New Testament. They were the literary class of a period when there was no recognised Jewish literature outside of the collection of the Old Testament Scriptures. They are occasionally spoken of in the Gospels as "lawyers" or "teachers of the law." They were the Doctors of Divinity of their day and were commonly addressed as "Rabbi," *i. e.*, "My Master." They so magnified their office as to claim that a child was to reverence his teacher above father and mother. Although it was necessary for them to labour for their own support, this was to be done in moderation, and they would accept no reward for their official services.

Although the scribes and the Pharisees are usually spoken of in the Gospels in such a way as to leave the impression that they were distinct classes, while having certain leading characteristics in common, yet such expressions as are found in Mark ii., 16, "the scribes of the Pharisees," and Luke v., 30, "the Pharisees and their scribes,"<sup>1</sup> point to the conclusion that a scribe might or might not be a Pharisee. Pharisaism appears to have been a development of scribism along certain special lines. While the nation was a unit in recognising the doctors of the law as the authoritative interpreters of the Scriptures, they were not thus united in opinion as to the degree of reverence due to the traditional law. It is this difference of attitude which in great part distinguishes the Pharisees from the Sadducees. On this point Josephus is explicit: "The Sadducees say that only what is written is to be esteemed as legal, while on the contrary, what has come down from the tradition of the fathers need not be observed."<sup>2</sup> But apart from this theological distinction the Sadducees were separated from the Pharisees still more by the barriers of social position and official rank; for the priestly offices were for the most part in the hands of the Sadducees. In recognising only the written law the Sadducees were strictly conservative, while in opposing to the popular necessarian notion of Divine predestination the claim of the ability of man to determine his own destiny they were radical rationalists.

From Philo, Josephus, and Pliny we have information concerning a body of men, hardly a sect, known as Essenes, who, though not mentioned in the New Testament, had too many characteristics in common with the first generation of the followers of Jesus to be

<sup>1</sup> The true reading is somewhat doubtful and may be "the Pharisees and the scribes among them."

<sup>2</sup> *Antiq.*, xiii., 10, 6. See also xviii., 1, 4.

altogether overlooked by the student of the Gospels. Existing before the beginning of our era as scattered religious communities dwelling for the most part outside of towns and cities and affecting an extreme purity of life, they became later a sort of monastic order, having all property in common. Their practice of celibacy, as well as the general simplicity and purity of their life and manners, assimilates them in some degree to the Shakers of our time. Their peculiar social customs apart, they may be considered as practically Pharisees of an extreme type. There has been considerable speculation among scholars as to the existence of a possible relation between primitive Christianity and Essenism.

*References.*—Renan, *History of the People of Israel*, Book IX., ch. v., vi.; Carpenter, *L. P.*, §§ 37, 38; Thayer, 121, γραμματεὺς; Schürer, II., i., 312, II., ii., 1, 188; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, Book III., ch. ii.; W. Robertson Smith's *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 42; *B.D.D.*, Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, i., 327; W. H. Bennett, *The Mishna as Illustrating the Gospels*, ch. iv.; C. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, J. Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*; M. Seidel, *In the Time of Jesus*, 98; Réville, i., 119; Hausrath, i., 135, Eng. tr.

### *E.—The Synagogue.*

After the return from the exile there sprung up among the Jews an institution corresponding in its main features to the modern Christian Sunday-school (excepting that it was conducted in the interest of both old and young) and surviving historically as the type of the stated Sunday-service of the Christian Church. The synagogue building, however, was not primarily a place of worship, but a place of instruction in the law, where the common people might learn something of that Divine wisdom which their daily occupations prevented them from securing by attendance upon the schools of the rabbis. It was the people's university or school of theology. That in apostolic times the Sabbath synagogue-service was supposed to date from a remote antiquity (see Acts xv., 21) only shows that it was already an established institution of no very recent origin.

As early as the New Testament times at least, and presumably from the very beginning, certain of the older and more respected members of the community were intrusted with the general management of the affairs of the synagogue. Of these one was selected to be the "ruler

of the synagogue." He was not, like the present-day minister of the Christian Church, an officiating "clergyman," but rather a sort of "archdeacon." He did not himself conduct the synagogue-services, but simply determined who should be called upon to do so. Some synagogues appear to have had two such presidents, although the evidence for this is not quite conclusive. Other functionaries were appointed for the discharge of various duties. Thus there was a "minister," who had charge of the rolls containing the Scriptures, and one or more collectors who received the alms of the congregation. Anyone might be called upon to repeat the prayers on behalf of the assembly, or to read from the Scriptures, or to address the people. The front seats in the synagogue were reserved for persons of distinction.

*References.*—Carpenter, *L. P.*, § 32; Réville, i., 102; Hausrath, i., 84, Eng. tr.; Schürer, II., ii., 44; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, Book III., ch. x.; Keil, *Biblical Archaeology*, I., 201, 446, II., 65; *B.D.D.*

#### *F.—Demoniacal Possession.*

A belief in the existence of evil spirits who are constantly working harm to individuals of the human race was common to most of the early Asiatic peoples. Although in its rudiments this faith may have existed among the early Israelites, yet its full development is to be traced to forces working during the Babylonian exile. In the religions of the East demonism and disease were, in the thought of the common people, quite inseparable, and, in place of a rational system of therapeutics based upon a knowledge of the laws of life, magical rites were depended upon to free men from the ills both of body and mind. The New Testament abounds in evidence that such was the belief and such the practice of the Jewish people in the time of Christ.

From some expressions in the Gospels it might seem that only certain defects and ailments were attributed to demonic agency; but there is no evidence that the evangelists had any other philosophy of disease than that which recognised it as having its source in influences altogether outside of the sufferer. If sometimes in the New Testament natural means of cure are combined with a resort to exorcism, in this there is only a reproduction of conditions existing long before under the Babylonish civilisation, where a medical practice

not unlike our own in its main features went hand in hand with a resort to incantations and charms. Even at the present day among some uncivilised tribes disease is attributed to demoniacal influence and treated by conjuration.

While the reality of demoniacal possession still has many defenders, the unmistakable trend of modern opinion is toward the complete rejection of the theory as an explanation of the phenomena of disease, even in the cases in which the evangelists unhesitatingly support the belief of their times. The principal ground for this rejection is the conviction that all the symptoms of so-called "possession" are symptoms of natural diseases either of body or of mind. Every symptom in the cases spoken of in the fifty-five passages where demons are mentioned in the New Testament can be paralleled in the familiar symptoms of insanity and epilepsy at the present day; and that philosophical principle which forbids the unnecessary multiplication of causes makes it incumbent upon us to reject a non-natural cause for phenomena which fall completely within the established province of the reign of law.

*References.*—Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, 478; Thayer's *N. T. Lexicon*, 123, 124; Carpenter, *L. P.*, 63; *Jewish Quarterly Review*, viii., 576, ix., 59, 444, 581; Keil, *Biblical Archaeology*, ii., 197; *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th ed., vii., 60.

### G.—*Son of Man.*

This phrase, which occurs 88 times in the Revised Text of the New Testament,<sup>1</sup> chiefly in the Gospels (Mt. 31 times, Mk. 14, Lk. 26, Jn. 13), and more than 100 times in the Old Testament, so far from having its meaning made clear by this frequent use, is one of the most difficult of Biblical terms to define with precision. It is, however, altogether in the New Testament that this uncertainty exists; in the Old Testament "son of man" is always a synonyme for "man."<sup>2</sup> The only O. T. passage which has ever been otherwise interpreted is Dan. vii., 13, where, in the King James version, the rendering "*the son of man*" is intended to convey the idea that there is a

<sup>1</sup> The Received Text has but 61 instances. The increase indicated above is due for the most part to the replacement of *υἱὸς Θεοῦ*, "son of God," by *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*, "son of man."

<sup>2</sup> The poetical parallelism of such passages as Ps. viii., 4 (quoted in Heb. ii., 6), lxxx., 17, cxliv., 3, well illustrates the usage.

reference to the Messiah. There is, however, in the original no article, and the Revisers rightly translate, "*a son of man*" *i. e.*, "*a man*." A contrast is intended between the four great beasts (verse 3), which the prophet saw in his dream and which represented four world-kings, and God's kingdom of righteousness yet to be set up on the earth. No individual man is thought of, although some of the later Jews did find here a prophecy of the Messiah. The king who was to have the "dominion and glory" (verse 14) was Jehovah Himself and no human representative.

In the New Testament two distinct uses of the phrase "son of man" are to be recognised, one of them identical with O. T. usage and the other associated with the personality of Jesus. It is a striking fact that the Synoptic writers represent Jesus as habitually speaking of himself as "the Son of Man," although no unmistakable indication is anywhere given of the sense in which he desired the phrase to be understood. That he meant by it to claim Messianic dignity is commonly asserted, and that he borrowed this supposed Messianic title from the passage in Daniel above referred to is very generally maintained. One of the most recent of English scholars of eminence, while recognising the true meaning of Daniel's "son of man," declares<sup>1</sup> that "the Lord had from the beginning of his ministry assumed the title of the Son of Man, and now at length [Mk. xiii., 26] he identifies himself with the object of Daniel's vision"; but the superficial verbal resemblance between the two passages affords a very slender foundation for this inference. If indeed Jesus, when he said to his disciples, "Then shall they see the Son of Man coming in clouds with great power and glory," had in mind the prophet's vision, we must suppose that he understood it rightly and meant by "the Son of Man" God's coming kingdom of righteousness and not a personal Messiah. This would be in harmony with what he elsewhere says about the coming of the Son of Man.

Other considerations are also conclusive against the supposition that Jesus adopted "the Son of Man" as a Messianic title. Not until Peter's declaration at Cæsarea Philippi, near the conclusion of the Galilean ministry, that Jesus was the Messiah<sup>2</sup> can this fact have been openly recognised among the disciples; otherwise Jesus would not have so commended Peter for extraordinary spiritual insight as to say to him, "flesh and blood have not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." Moreover, not only had

<sup>1</sup> Swete, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 293.    <sup>2</sup> Matt. xvi., 16.

Jesus before this steadily refrained from everything which might savour of Messianic pretension, but on this occasion he specifically charged the disciples that they should say to no one that he was the Christ. All this is at complete variance with the idea that Jesus had been for a long time substituting for "I" a phrase which everybody would recognise as a Messianic title. Add the further considerations, that his disciples never address him by this supposed title of honour, and that after his death he is not represented as having been often referred to in this way, and the conclusion seems inevitable that the contemporaries of Jesus did not consider "Son of Man" synonymous with "Messiah."

There are, nevertheless, certain passages of the New Testament which indicate that what was not originally a Messianic title came to be so looked upon in its application to Jesus simply because his disciples came to believe in him as the expected Messiah. As he had called himself "the Son of Man" and was "the Messiah," therefore it seemed that to be the Son of Man was to be the Messiah.

But what, in reality, did Jesus mean by speaking of himself as "the Son of Man"? While it is not directly answering the question to say that he meant just what he would have meant if he had called himself "the man," to distinctly realise this fact is to take the first step toward understanding his full meaning. It is always to be borne in mind that he spoke Aramaic and not Greek, and that in Aramaic there could be no distinction excepting of form between "man" and "son of man." "Son of man" in the New Testament is a Hebrew idiom literally rendered into Greek; "man" would have been the native Greek idiom, which the evangelists doubtless would have adopted had they not been unskilled in translation and enslaved to the renderings of the LXX. Now nine-tenths of all the O. T. passages containing the phrase in question are found in the book of Ezekiel. From the beginning to the end of the book Jehovah constantly addresses the prophet as "son of man." His very first words to him are, "Son of man, I send thee to the children of Israel. I do send thee unto them: and thou shalt say unto them and they, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear (for they are a rebellious house), yet shall know that there hath been a prophet among them thou shalt speak my words unto them and he said unto me, Son of man, go, get thee unto the house of Israel, and speak with my words unto them: for thou art not sent to a people of a strange speech and of a hard language, whose words thou canst not understand Son of man, I have made thee a watchman

unto the house of Israel : therefore hear the word of my mouth and give them warning from me " (ii., 3 ff.). To cite all the passages which are in this vein would be to transcribe no small portion of the book. Enough has been given to suggest if not fully to warrant the conclusion that Jesus, in speaking of himself as "the Son of Man," intended to announce himself as a prophet, sent to warn his people of the danger which threatened them if they did not turn from their evil ways. Nothing is made plainer in the Gospel record than that Jesus believed himself to be intrusted with a Divine message. When he stood up to read in the synagogue at Nazareth (Lk. iv., 16 ff.) he proclaimed himself at once, both by his selection from the Scriptures and his comment thereon, to be a preacher of good tidings to the poor and a messenger of freedom to those who were in the bondage of sin (Cp. Mt. v., 3, 4). Moreover, in his sympathy with human suffering and his earnest longing to be a true saviour of men it was not "Messiah" which he wished to be called — a name suggestive of the misery of war and not of the blessings of peace — but simply "man," a member of the human family, a brother to all mankind.

*References.* — Cone's *The Gospel and its Earliest Interpreters*, 98; Cone's *Gospel Criticism*, 268; *The New World*, No. IX., 492; Drummond's *Jewish Messiah*, 228; E. Reuss, *Histoire de la Théologie Chrétienne*, 3me ed., i., 227; B. Weiss, *Biblical Theology of the N. T.*, § 16; Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, iii., 78; Nathaniel Schmidt, *Was בר נשא a Messianic Title?* (in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xv.).

#### H. — *The Talmud.*

Besides the written law many of the Jews of the time of Jesus accepted as at least of equal authority a body of oral interpretations of the law, which interpretations, it was claimed, had originated with Moses and had been handed down intact from generation to generation. In point of fact the formal beginning of these teachings does not date from earlier than about 300 B.C. It was these traditional precepts which Jesus not infrequently found to be not an interpretation but a perversion of the teachings of Scripture. Fortunately for our better understanding of the religious history of the New Testament times this oral tradition, which was in fact the sum of the rabbinical interpretation and application of the Old Testament, at length, in the early part of the Christian era, assumed a written form and is still preserved to us under the name of *Talmud*, or "study," that is,



studies of the law. Under this word are now comprehended both the *Mishna* — or original teachings of the rabbis down to the end of the second century A.D. — and the *Gemara*, the later comment on these teachings.<sup>1</sup> In the word “mishna” is implied either the secondary rank of the collection thus designated, as compared with the Old Testament law, or its oral and traditional character; upon this point etymologists are not agreed. Neither is the meaning of “gemara” altogether certain: it may be equivalent to “completion” or “supplement,” or it may be only a synonyme for “talmud.” The Mishna is divided into six principal parts, according to the subject-matter treated of. A more general division of the Gemara is into *Halacha* and *Agada*, the latter being subdivided into six sections corresponding to the six of the Mishna. Under “halacha” are included all discussions of points of law, custom, and usage; while the term “agada” = “sayings” or “stories,” covers all the rest. The Gemara exists in two forms, known respectively as the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds. The former is of much greater extent than the latter, and deals more exclusively with religious matters.

The origin of the Mishna as a systematic collection of teachings is to be found in the great difficulty which the rabbis naturally experienced in retaining in memory a constantly increasing body of undigested precepts interpretative of the whole legal code and aiming to be regulative of all, even the minutest, concerns of every-day life. Occasionally a rabbi who felt that the burden upon his memory was greater than he could bear would stealthily commit to writing and use in secret some portion of that tradition which custom forbade him to transmit to others except by word of mouth. Whether the Mishna took on a written form as early as the latter part of the second century or not until the sixth is a matter of dispute. The language of the Mishna is a modernised Hebrew. If an Englishman to-day should attempt to use for literary purposes the vocabulary of Chaucer, supplementing it with such terms of later origin as were necessary for the expression of new ideas and the mention of objects unknown to the poet, he would be likely to produce a dialect analogous to that of

<sup>1</sup> Some of the rabbis likened the Scriptures to water, the Mishna to wine, and the Gemara to hippocras. Another comparison of the three was to salt, pepper, and frankincense. While the direct study of the Scriptures was looked upon as of no value, to read the Mishna was thought to be a good thing, and the devotion of one's self to the mastering of the Gemara was declared to be the noblest virtue.

the Talmudic Hebrew. The purity of the ancient language could by no means be preserved, and the Mishna has no small infusion of words borrowed from other tongues, especially from the Aramaic and the Greek.

The method of the Mishna, so far as it is an interpretation of the written law, is a mingling of natural and artificial exegesis. In its forcing of the primitive meaning of passages which do not otherwise lend themselves readily to the purposes of the interpreter it rivals the altogether unscientific Scripture-comment of many Christian scholars.

*References.*—Drummond's *Jewish Messiah*, Book I., ch. v.; M. Mielsner, *Introduction to the Talmud*; F. Weber, *Die Lehren des Talmud*; W. H. Bennett, *The Mishna as Illustrating the Gospels*; J. Barclay, *The Talmud*; *Encyclopædia Britannica*, xxiii., 35; *Johnson's Cyclopædia*, new ed., vii., 889; *B.D.D.*

### I.—Parables.

Parables are found in almost all literatures, but especially in the Old and New Testaments and the Talmud. The word "parable" occurs fifty times in the New Testament, but its use is limited almost entirely to the Synoptics. No instance is found in the Fourth Gospel. Etymologically the word denotes a "comparison" of any kind; but in the Gospels its application is generally limited to a particular form of figurative narration. Sometimes it is used in the sense of a "proverb" or "maxim," the idea of comparison or illustration being apparently altogether lacking. This is an Old Testament usage.

The "parable" is distinguished, on the one hand, from the "allegory," with which it has much in common, chiefly by its having but a single aim and so not being significant in all its parts, and, on the other hand, from the fable by its loftier tone and its freedom from non-natural elements. In the New Testament only in the parable of Dives and Lazarus is the last-named condition absent. In the fable dumb animals often speak, and not only animals but trees and plants are represented as acting altogether like human beings. The fable, however, never rises above the level of that worldly wisdom commonly called prudence, while it is the aim of the parable to illustrate moral and spiritual truth.

It follows from the ethical use which Jesus makes of the parabolic form of teaching, that his parables are capable of classification under a few general heads. Stapfer, whose plan is one of the best which

have been proposed, arranges them in three groups, looking both to their chronological setting and their internal characteristics.—The first group consists of the six parables found in §§ 70, 74, 75, 76, 77, 81. They have this characteristic in common, apart from the circumstance of their having all been delivered during the early part of the ministry of Jesus, that their purpose is to set forth in similitudes the nature of the coming kingdom of heaven. What may be called the scenery of these parables is drawn from external nature and the ordinary occupations and experiences of men and women.—The second group, belonging to a later time, consists of sixteen parables found for the most part only in Luke's Gospel. They are distinguished from those of the preceding group by not being introduced into the popular discourses of Jesus, but being given in response to interrogatories addressed to him in private, as well as by their making use not so much of simple facts of nature as of the complex experiences of human life.—To the latter part of the life of Jesus belong those six chiefly prophetic parables in which he again discourses of the kingdom of heaven, but with a wider outlook over the future.

*References.*—S. Goebel, *The Parables of Jesus*, Introduction ; A. B. Bruce, *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, Introduction ; S. D. F. Salmond, *The Parables of our Lord*, Introduction ; R. C. Trench, *Notes on the Parables*, ch. i. ; H. B. Swete, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 62.

### *J.—The Cross and Crucifixion.*

Often as the cross is mentioned in the New Testament in connection with the death of Jesus, its form, structure, and manner of use are nowhere described. This is doubtless due to the fact that a mode of punishment so common and well known needed no description. Neither do we learn anything of importance concerning the cross from the Old Testament, since the early Hebrew, Egyptian, and Persian punishment of "hanging upon a tree" (Deut. xxi., 22 ; Gen. xl., 19 ; Esther v., 14) appears to have been only posthumous impalement, the instrument of which was a sharpened stake piercing the corpse, and not something to which the living body was attached. The Hebrew verb used to describe the act of impalement is *lalah*, which means simply *to hang up, to suspend*. In early Greek literature, from Homer down, *stauros*, the later and N. T. word for "cross," signifies merely "a pointed stake," used for whatever purpose. When specialised to denote the upright beam erected for use in capital executions it came

to have a meaning not unlike that of the English word "stake" in the expression "to burn at the stake."

Crucifixion proper was a punishment unknown to the Jews before they came in contact with foreign peoples. The Roman occupation of Palestine made them familiar with the cross as they had never been before. The cross in its most common form consisted essentially of a short cross-beam fastened either upon or near the top of an upright post somewhat taller than the height of a man. The "Latin cross," in which the cross-beam is below the top of the stake, is generally thought to have been the one upon which Jesus suffered. This supposition, however, rests upon no historical foundation; on the contrary the oldest known representation of the Christian emblem, found in the Roman catacombs, is that of the "Egyptian cross," which is identical in shape with the Roman capital letter T. The testimony of the *Epistle of Barnabas* (ch. ix.), perhaps equally ancient, points in the same direction.

Among the Romans punishment by crucifixion was generally reserved for the vilest criminals, although slaves were liable to be crucified for even the slightest offences. No other punishment was considered so ignominious. What the gallows is to us, the cross was to the peoples of antiquity. There are cases on record in which three thousand or more prisoners of war were crucified at one time. Even the Greeks, who were not ordinarily given to the infliction of barbarous punishments, were sometimes led to imitate the savagery of other nations and to crucify the inhabitants of conquered cities.

The criminal who was to suffer punishment by crucifixion was first scourged, and this scourging was sometimes so severe as to result in death. The cross-beam, to which his arms were to be fastened, was carried by the condemned one himself to the place of execution. Then his clothes were stripped from him and divided among the executioners. If the perpendicular support had been already set up, nothing remained to be done but to raise the sufferer and fasten the cross-beam, to which his hands were either nailed or tied, in its proper place. The weight of the body was partly supported by a narrow seat, and the feet were fastened to the lower part of the upright, sometimes by a single nail passing through both. There may have been sometimes a support for the feet. Ordinarily no other wounds were inflicted than those made by the driving of nails through the hands and feet. Death came as the result of starvation and long-continued exposure, and so was delayed a longer or a shorter time according to the previous bodily condition of the sufferer. It is the judgment

of an English physician of repute—Dr. W. A. Nicholson—that “we may consider thirty-six hours to be the earliest period at which crucifixion would cause death in a healthy adult”; and there are cases on record in which death did not come until the ninth day. A young Turk crucified at Damascus in 1247 lived upon the cross two days.

That recovery from the effects of crucifixion was sometimes possible appears from the testimony of Josephus, who says that, when he was sent by Titus on a certain expedition, he recognised among a large number of crucified captives three of his acquaintances, whose release he secured, and one of whom was with some difficulty restored to life. Some of the fanatical French “convulsionists” of the last century had themselves crucified several times over, that they might thus share in the sufferings of him whose death they could more easily imitate than his life.

### K.—*Miracles.*

In the Authorised Version of the New Testament the word “miracle” occurs thirty times; in the Revised Version only eight. This diminution is due chiefly to a more exact rendering of Greek words. The Revisers indicate in the margin that in five of the passages where the word “miracles” has been retained the Greek word thus translated<sup>1</sup> has the meaning of “powers” and in the other three of “signs.”<sup>2</sup> A third word,<sup>3</sup> meaning “wonders,” is often found in connection with one or both of the others, as in Acts ii., 22, “mighty works and wonders and signs.”<sup>4</sup> To blend these three substantially synonymous terms into one formula, it may be said that in the New Testament, as elsewhere, *wonderful deeds* are looked upon as *signs* of the exercise of remarkable *powers*. All those acts of Jesus and his apostles which in the record are described by these several terms are characterised in Christian theology as “miracles.” Moreover, whatever elements in the New Testament anyone judges to be supernatural are commonly spoken of as miracles, whether so designated in the Scriptures or not. Originally, however, the word “miracle,” formed from the Latin *miraculum*, was simply equivalent to “wonder,”<sup>5</sup> in which sense it is still sometimes used. Hume describes a

<sup>1</sup> δυνάμεις, *dunamëis*.

<sup>2</sup> σημεῖα, *sēmëia*.

<sup>3</sup> τέρατα, *tërata*.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. 2 Cor. xii., 12.

<sup>5</sup> In Livy, *History of Rome*, ii., 7, a mysterious voice, imagined by those who heard it to come from the world of shades, is called a *miraculum*.

miracle as "a transgression of a law of nature by a particular volition of the Deity, or by the interposition of some invisible agent." More concisely miracle has been defined as "violation of a law of nature"; something "contrary to the ordinary course of nature." This is the sense in which the word has been commonly used for at least two centuries. Channing says of miracles, "They are the acts and manifestations of a spiritual power in the universe, superior to the powers and laws of matter." If miracle is to be thus defined, it must be said that it was not the intention of any of the New Testament writers to represent Jesus as working miracles, for, knowing nothing of laws of nature—an altogether modern conception—they could of course have no idea of a violation of a law of nature. They rightly believed that the Deity was the source of all power, but they did not know, what modern science has demonstrated to us, that His ways of working both in the world of matter and the world of mind are uniform and not capricious. In their philosophy of nature and man all human power was ascribed to a Divine source, although some men were thought to be more highly gifted than others and so able to perform more wonderful works. The peculiarity believed to be observable in some of the acts of Jesus was that they gave evidence of his possession of powers such as had been denied to other men. The present tendency of religious thought upon this subject is toward a conception not identical with that of the New Testament writers, but not far removed from it. A representative religious journal has recently put forth the following statement: "By a miracle we understand a phenomenon which *at the time* transcends the range of human knowledge to explain and power to reproduce."<sup>1</sup> This is to make our present knowledge and ability and not any objective difference the standard of discrimination between the natural and the supernatural. According to this view, now widely accepted, an increase of knowledge may yet lead to the breaking down of all barriers between the supposed non-natural and the realm of cosmic law.

By far the larger number of the so-called miracles of the New Testament are marvels of healing. It is a general characteristic of these cures that they are wrought by the influence of mind upon body, without the employment of extraneous curative agencies. The method of Jesus was the method of a rational "mind-cure."

<sup>1</sup> *The Outlook*, January 21, 1899.



# TEXT-INDEX.

## Matthew.

<b>1</b>	1-17	§	1	7-11	§	55	2-6	§	63		
	18-25	§	2	12	§	56	7-19	§	64		
<b>2</b>	1-12	§	3	13, 14	§	57	20-24	§	89		
	13-18	§	4	15-20	§	58	25-27	§	99		
	19-23	§	5	21-23	§	59	28-30	§	100		
<b>3</b>	1-12	§	14	24-27	§	60	<b>12</b>	1-8	§	28	
	13-17	§	15	28, 29	§	61		9-14	§	29	
<b>4</b>	1-11	§	16	<b>8</b>	1-4	§	23	15-21	§	32	
	12-17	§	17		5-13	§	62	22-24	§	65	
	18-22	§	18		14-17	§	20	25-32	§	66	
	23-25	§	22		18	§	83	33-35	§	58	
<b>5</b>	1, 2	§	34		19-22	§	124	36, 37	§	66	
	3-12	§	35		23-27	§	83	38-42	§	67	
	13-16	§	36		28-34	§	84	43-45	§	68	
	17-20	§	37	<b>9</b>	1-8	§	25	46-50	§	69	
	21-26	§	38		9-13	§	26	<b>13</b>	1-9	§	70
	27-32	§	39		14-17	§	27		10-17	§	71
	33-37	§	40		18-26	§	85		18-23	§	72
	38-42	§	41		27-31	§	134		24-30	§	74
	43-48	§	42		32-34	§	65		31, 32	§	76
<b>6</b>	1-4	§	43		35-38	§	88		33	§	77
	5-8	§	44	<b>10</b>	1	§	88		34, 35	§	78
	9-15	§	45		2-4	§	33		36-43	§	79
	16-18	§	46		5-16	§	88		44-46	§	80
	19-21	§	47		17-25	§	90		47-50	§	81
	22, 23	§	48		26-33	§	91		51, 52	§	82
	24	§	49		34-36	§	92		53-58	§	87
	25-34	§	51		37-39	§	93	<b>14</b>	1, 2	§	96
<b>7</b>	1-5	§	52		40-42	§	94		3-12	§	97
	6	§	53	<b>11</b>	1	§	95		13-21	§	101



*Matthew (Continued).*

<b>14</b>	22-36	§	102	<b>12</b>	13	§	140	14-30	§	171	
<b>15</b>	1-20	§	103		14-17	§	141	31-46	§	172	
	21-28	§	104		18, 19	§	137	<b>26</b>	1-5	§	173
	29-31	§	105		20-22	§	142		6-13	§	174
	32-39	§	106		23-27	§	143		14-16	§	175
<b>16</b>	1-4	§	107		28-32	§	144		17-20	§	176
	5-12	§	108		33-46	§	147		21-25	§	177
	13-23	§	110	<b>22</b>	1-14	§	149		26-29	§	178
	24-28	§	111		15-22	§	150		30-35	§	179
<b>17</b>	1-13	§	112		23-33	§	151		36-46	§	181
	14-21	§	113		34-40	§	152		47-56	§	182
	22, 23	§	114		41-46	§	154		57-68	§	183
	24-27	§	115	<b>23</b>	1-36	§	155		69-75	§	184
<b>18</b>	1-5	§	116		37-39	§	156	<b>27</b>	1, 2	§	185
	6-9	§	118	<b>24</b>	1-3	§	158		3-10	§	186
	10-14	§	119		4-8	§	159		11-14	§	187
	15-22	§	120		9-14	§	160		15-26	§	189
	23-35	§	121		15-22	§	161		27-31	§	190
<b>19</b>	1, 2	§	123		23-25	§	162		32	§	191
	3-12	§	126		26, 27	§	163		33-44	§	192
	13-15	§	127		28	§	167		45-56	§	193
	16-30	§	128		29-31	§	164		57-61	§	194
<b>20</b>	1-16	§	131		32, 33	§	165		62-66	§	195
	17-19	§	132		34-36	§	166	<b>28</b>	1-10	§	196
	20-28	§	133		37-41	§	167		11-15	§	197
	29-34	§	134		42-51	§	169		16-20	§	200
<b>21</b>	1-11	§	136	<b>25</b>	1-13	§	170				

*Mark.*

<b>1</b>	1-8	§	14	<b>2</b>	1-12	§	25	<b>4</b>	1-9	§	70
	9-11	§	15		13-17	§	26		10-12	§	71
	12, 13	§	16		18-22	§	27		13-20	§	72
	14, 15	§	17		23-28	§	28		21-25	§	73
	16-20	§	18	<b>3</b>	1-6	§	29		26-29	§	75
	21-28	§	19		7-12	§	32		30-32	§	76
	29-34	§	20		13-19	§	33		33, 34	§	78
	35-38	§	21		20-22	§	65		35-41	§	83
	39	§	22		23-30	§	66	<b>5</b>	1-20	§	84
	40-45	§	23		31-35	§	69		21-43	§	85

*Mark (Continued).*

<b>6</b>	1-6a	87	2-12	126	28, 29	165
	6b-11	88	13-16	127	30-32	166
	12, 13	95	17-31	128	33-37	172
	14-16	96	32-34	132	<b>14</b> 1, 2	173
	17-29	97	35-45	133	3-9	174
	30	98	46-52	134	10, 11	175
	31-44	101	<b>11</b> 1-11	136	12-17	176
	45-56	102	12-14	137	18-21	177
<b>7</b>	1-23	103	15-17	140	22-25	178
	24-30	104	18, 19	141	26-31	179
	31-37	105	20-26	142	32-42	181
<b>8</b>	1-10	106	27-33	143	43-52	182
	11-13	107	<b>12</b> 1-12	147	53-65	183
	14-21	108	13-17	150	66-72	184
	22-26	109	18-27	151	<b>15</b> 1	185
	27-33	110	28-34	152	2-5	187
	34-38	111	35-37	154	6-15	189
<b>9</b>	1	111	38-40	155	16-20	190
	2-13	112	41-44	157	21	191
	14-29	113	<b>13</b> 1-4	158	22-32	192
	30-32	114	5-9a	159	33-41	193
	33-37	116	9b-13	160	42-47	194
	38-41	117	14-20	161	<b>16</b> 1-8	196
	42-50	118	21-23	162	9-20	202
<b>10</b>	1	123	24-27	164		

*Luke.*

<b>1</b>	1-4	6	<b>4</b>	1-13	16	<b>6</b>	1-5	28
	5-25	7		14, 15	17		6-11	29
	26-38	8		16-30	87		12-16	33
	39-56	9		31-37	19		17-19	32
	57-80	10		38-41	20		20a	34
<b>2</b>	1-20	11		42, 43	21		20b-26	35
	21-39	12		44	22		27, 28	42
	40-52	13	<b>5</b>	1-11	18		29, 30	41
<b>3</b>	1-18	14		12-16	23		31	56
	19, 20	97		17-26	25		32-36	42
	21, 22	15		27-32	26		37-42	52
	23-38	1		33-39	27		43-45	58

<b>6</b>	46	2	59		38-42	2	125		15-24	2	149
	47-49	2	60	<b>11</b>	1-4	2	45		25-33	2	93
<b>7</b>	1-10	2	62		5-8	2	54		34, 35	2	36
	11-17	2	86		9-13	2	55	<b>15</b>	1-10	2	119
	18-23	2	63		14-16	2	65		11-32	2	145
	24-28	2	64		17-23	2	66	<b>16</b>	1-12	2	129
	29, 30	2	144		24-26	2	68		13	2	49
	31-35	2	64		27, 28	2	69		14, 15	2	129
	36-50	2	174		29-32	2	67		16	2	64
<b>8</b>	1-3	2	125		33	2	36		17	2	37
	4-8	2	70		34-36	2	48		18	2	39
	9, 10	2	71		37-52	2	155		19-31	2	130
	11-15	2	72	<b>12</b>	53, 54	2	108	<b>17</b>	1, 2	2	118
	16-18	2	73		1	2	108		3, 4	2	120
	19-21	2	69		2-9	2	91		5, 6	2	113
	22-25	2	83		10	2	66		7-10	2	169
	26-39	2	84		11, 12	2	90		11-19	2	24
	40-56	2	85		13-21	2	50		20-25	2	163
<b>9</b>	1-5	2	88		22-32	2	51		26-37	2	167
	6	2	95		33, 34	2	47	<b>18</b>	1-8	2	168
	7-9	2	96		35-48	2	169		9-14	2	146
	10a	2	98		49, 50	2	133		15-17	2	127
	10b-17	2	101		51-53	2	92		18-30	2	128
	18-22	2	110		54-56	2	107		31-34	2	132
	23-27	2	111		57-59	2	38		35-43	2	134
	28-36	2	112	<b>13</b>	1-5	2	138	<b>19</b>	1-10	2	135
	37-43a	2	113		6-9	2	139		11-27	2	171
	43b-45	2	114		10-17	2	30		28-44	2	136
	46-48	2	116		18, 19	2	76		45, 46	2	140
	49, 50	2	117		20, 21	2	77		47, 48	2	141
	51-56	2	123		22	2	88	<b>20</b>	1-8	2	143
	57-62	2	124		23, 24	2	57		9-19	2	147
<b>10</b>	1-12	2	88		25	2	170		20-26	2	150
	13-16	2	89		26, 27	2	59		27-38	2	151
	17-20	2	98		28-30	2	62		39, 40	2	152
	21, 22	2	99		31-33	2	122		41-44	2	154
	23, 24	2	71		34, 35	2	156		45-47	2	155
	25-28	2	152	<b>14</b>	1-6	2	31	<b>21</b>	1-4	2	157
	29-37	2	153		7-14	2	148		5-7	2	158

*Luke (Continued).*

<b>21</b>	8-11	§	159	21-23	§	177	2-5	§	187	
	12-19	§	160	24-27	§	133	6-16	§	188	
	20-24	§	161	28-30	§	128	17-25	§	189	
	25-28	§	164	31-34	§	179	26-32	§	191	
	29-31	§	165	35-38	§	180	33-43	§	192	
	32, 33	§	166	39-46	§	181	44-49	§	193	
	34-38	§	172	47-53	§	182	50-56	§	194	
<b>22</b>	1, 2	§	173	54, 55	§	183	<b>24</b>	1-11 (12)	§	196
	3-6	§	175	56-62	§	184		13-35	§	198
	7-14	§	176	63-71	§	183		36-49	§	199
	15-20	§	178	<b>23</b>	1	§		185	50-53	§



## THE GOSPEL AND ITS EARLIEST INTERPRETATIONS

**A Study of the Teaching of Jesus and its Doctrinal Transformations in the New Testament. 8vo, gilt top, pp. viii-413, \$1.75.**

CHIEF CONTENTS.—INTRODUCTION, THE HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL TREATMENT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT—I. THE TEACHING OF JESUS—II. THE JEWISH-CHRISTIAN INTERPRETATION—III. THE PAULINE TRANSFORMATION—IV. THE DEUTERO-PAULINE INTERPRETATIONS—V. THE JOHANNINE TRANSFORMATION—VI. ANTI-GNOSTIC INTERPRETATIONS—VII. JEWISH-CHRISTIAN APOCALYPTIC—VIII. THE GOSPEL AND THEOLOGY.

The object of this work is to elucidate the teaching of Jesus and to present both in their relation to it and to one another the principal types of religious doctrine contained in the New Testament.

"The scholarship, skill, and spiritual insight and sympathy evinced, have created a picture of the teaching of Jesus and of the Pauline, Johannine, and other transformations and interpretations of it which, I believe, is unique in our language, and which will be welcomed and appreciated by all who are interested in the supreme question of our age."—J. G. SCHURMAN, *President of Cornell University*.

"An admirable sketch of the vicissitudes of Christian doctrine within the limits of the canonical writings."—DR. C. H. TOY, *of Harvard University*.

"Rev. Dr. Cone's second volume in the field where he is so erudite a scholar, so candid a thinker, and so lucid a writer, will confirm the high position at once accorded him by discerning readers of his work on *Gospel-Criticism and Historical Christianity*."—*The Literary World*.

"Handles the subject with perfect candor, learning, and skill, yet not without the caution and reverence that belong to every phase of biblical exegesis."—*The National Baptist*.

---

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

FOR SALE BY ALL BOOKSELLERS.

[OVER]

## GOSPEL-CRITICISM AND HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY

**A Study of the Gospels and of the History of the Gospel-Canon during the Second Century; together with a Consideration of the Results of Modern Criticism. Second Edition, 8vo, gilt top, pp. xiii-365, \$1.75.**

CHIEF CONTENTS.—I. THE TEXT—II. THE CANON—III. THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM—IV. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK—V. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW—VI. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE—VII. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN—VIII. THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE GOSPELS—IX. DOGMATIC “TENDENCIES” IN THE GOSPELS—X. THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE GOSPELS; OR, THE HERMENEUTICS OF THE EVANGELISTS—XI. THE GOSPELS AS HISTORIES—XII. CRITICISM AND HISTORICAL CHRISTIANITY.

“A strong book, and well worth reading by any one who knows or does not know the recent results of the higher criticism.”—*Christian Union*.

“The work of a scholar who has made himself familiar with the most important recent investigations, and who appreciates the nature and bearing of the questions at issue. Replete with information for those who have not made the subject a specialty, and executed in a spirit of candor and rational inquiry.”—GEO. B. STEVENS, *Professor of New-Testament Criticism in Yale University, in Yale Review*.

“It is not excelled in attractiveness by any work that has been written on the subject.”—PROF. C. H. TOY.

“I admire its careful learning and thorough mastery of the subject, and more I admire the singular mental poise which it exhibits. Such a book marks an era in American scholarship.”—R. HEBER NEWTON, D.D.

“A thoroughly scholarly work; its tone is deeply reverent and spiritual, and its literary style is marked by sobriety and conspicuous refinement and grace. It has commanded throughout our close attention and frequent admiration.”—*The London Literary World*.

“I feel very great admiration for the scholarship and wisdom shown in the treatment of the whole subject. The book is admirable and cannot fail to do great good among thinking men.”—ANDREW D. WHITE.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

FOR SALE BY ALL BOOKSELLERS.

[OVER]

*"A nobly attractive book."*

# PAUL, THE MAN, THE MISSIONARY, AND THE TEACHER

BY ORELLO CONE, D.D.

Cloth, gilt top, \$2.00

CHIEF CONTENTS—PART I. THE MAN: 1. FORMATIVE INFLUENCES; 2. PERSONAL TRAITS; 3. THE CONVERSION. PART II. THE MISSIONARY: 1. THE FIRST YEARS—GALATIA AND THE GALATIAN EPISTLE; 2. PHILIPPI, THESSALONICA, CORINTH; 3. EPHESUS—ROME; 4. THE PAUL OF THE ACTS AND THE PAUL OF THE EPISTLES. PART III. THE TEACHER: 1. THE LAW; 2. "LIFE," "DEATH," AND "SALVATION;" 3. DOCTRINE OF SIN; 4. SALVATION—ATONEMENT; 5. PERSON OF CHRIST; 6. SUPERNATURALISM; 7. FAITH AND JUSTIFICATION; 8. ETHICS; 9. PREDESTINATION; 10. THE CHURCH AND THE SACRAMENTS; 11. ESCHATOLOGY.

*"An exposition of Paul as he was."*

—DR. THOS. R. SLICER in *The New World*.

"Among the many treatises on Paulinism published of recent years, this book takes a high place. In the present writer's judgment **it surpasses all others written in English in acumen and vigor.** . . . A special merit of the presentation of Paul's ideas **is the fulness and lucidity** with which the subtle and mystical elements of his thought are stated. Dr. Cone's style has a sinewy vigor which makes his book easy reading throughout."

—PROF. E. Y. HINCKS of Andover in *The Church*.

"As **an exhaustive and luminous** account of the life and work of Paul as a missionary to the gentiles and as a teacher, it stands unrivalled. Part III is a masterly exposition of the apostle's thought which leaves nothing to be desired."—*The Aberdeen Journal*.

"Biblical scholarship in America has not produced a more creditable work than this."—*The Christian Register*.

"**A standard work** will for a long time constitute the point of departure for all studies of Paul that are to be taken seriously."

—PROF. H. HOLTZMANN, *University of Strassburg*.

[OVER]



“It is long since so great a conflict of emotions has been stirred within us by any critical production. We have in this book received accounts of the content of Pauline ideas not surpassed for warmth and reverence and plenitude in the writings of Canon Liddon reporting with almost incredible accuracy the height and depth and length and breadth of that spiritual Paulinism which has of late years suffered so many things in the house of its friends.”

—PRESIDENT CHAS. CUTHBERT HALL in *The Expositor*.

“One of the most thorough and suggestive interpretations of the apostle that this generation has produced.”

—*The Outlook* (Lond).

“The whole volume is an able one, and has been very carefully thought out.”—*The Glasgow Mail*.

“This thoughtful and forcible volume deserves the attention of the scholarly world.”—*The Congregationalist*.

“The work is one of great ability and extensive learning, evincing much acumen and exegetical power.”

—*The Edinburgh Scotsman*.

“We would say with emphasis that we recognize his ability, his candor, and his frequent insight into the very depths of the subjects he discusses.”—*The Spectator* (Lond).

“A solid work of permanent scientific value.”

—DR. O. PFLEIDERER, *University of Berlin*.

“He writes from the point of view of an accomplished scholar follows through the Epistles certain distinct lines of thought and doctrine with remarkable vigor and acumen.”—DR. H. VAN DYKE in *The Outlook*, New York.

“As a critical study it is thorough, even masterly.”

—*The Independent*, (Eng.)

---

PUBLISHED BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, New York

A. & C. BLACK, London

# Recent Publications.

**CHRISTIANITY AND ANTI-CHRISTIANITY IN THEIR FINAL CONFLICT.** By SAMUEL J. ANDREWS, author of "The Life of Our Lord upon Earth," etc. 8° \$2 00

"This is in many respects a remarkable book. It deals with the important Bible truths, of which little has been heard of late. The same scholarly breadth and thoroughness which characterize the author's 'Life of Christ' are stamped also on this work. The book deserves a thoughtful reading by all Christians."—*The Observer*.

## HEROES OF THE REFORMATION.

A series of biographies of the leaders in the Protestant Reformation, men who, while differing in their gifts, were influenced by the same spirit. The series is edited by SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History, New York University. Each fully illustrated. 12° \$1 50

- I.—**MARTIN LUTHER**, The Hero of the Reformation. By HENRY E. JACOBS, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology, Evangelical Lutheran Seminary, Philadelphia.
- 2.—**PHILIP MELANCHTHON**, The Protestant Preceptor of Germany. By JAMES W. RICHARD, Professor of Homiletics, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.
- 3.—**DESIDERIUS ERASMUS**, of Rotterdam, the Humanist in the Service of the Reformation. By EPHRAIM EMERTON, Ph.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Harvard University.
- 4.—**THEODORE BEZA**, the Counsellor of the French Reformation. By HENRY MARTYN BAIRD, Ph.D., Professor of the Greek Language and Literature, New York University; author of "The Huguenots," 6 vols.

For titles of volumes in preparation, write for separate descriptive circular.

## THE AMERICAN LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS.

Each, 8°, \$1 50.

- I.—**BUDDHISM: ITS HISTORY AND LITERATURE.** By T. W. RHYS-DAVIDS, LL.D., Ph.D., Chairman of the Pali Text Society; Secretary and Librarian of the Royal Asiatic Society; Professor of Pali and Buddhist Literature at University College, London.
- 2.—**RELIGIONS OF PRIMITIVE PEOPLES.** By DANIEL G. BRINTON, A.M., M.D., LL.D., D.Sc., Professor of Archæology and Linguistics in the University of Pennsylvania.
- 3.—**JEWISH RELIGIOUS LIFE AFTER THE EXILE.** By T. K. CHEYNE, of University of Oxford.
- 4.—**THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL TO THE EXILE.** By KARL BUDDE, of the University of Strasburg, Germany.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, New York and London.

By W. M. RAMSAY.

---

## THE CHURCH IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE BEFORE A.D. 170.

With Maps and Illustrations, 8vo

\$3.00

"It is a book of very exceptional value, Prof. Ramsay is a real scholar and of the very best type of scholarship. A thoroughly good book; a product of first-hand and accurate scholarship; in the highest degree suggestive; and not only valuable in its results, but an admirable example of the true method of research."  
—*The Churchman*.

## ST. PAUL THE TRAVELLER AND THE ROMAN CITIZEN.

With Map, 8vo

\$3.00

"A work which marks an important step in advance in the historical interpretation of St. Paul. It is an immense gain to have the narrative lifted from the mean function of being an artful monument and mirror of a strife internal to Christianity which it seeks by a process, now of creation, now of elimination, to overcome and to conceal, to the high purpose of representing the religion as it began within the Empire and as it actually was to the Empire and the Empire to it. Professor Ramsay has made a solid and valuable contribution to the interpretation of the Apostolic literature and of the Apostolic age—a contribution distinguished no less by ripe scholarship, independent judgment, keen vision, and easy mastery of material, than by freshness of thought, boldness of combination, and striking originality of view."  
—*The Speaker*.

## IMPRESSIONS OF TURKEY DURING TWELVE YEARS' WANDERINGS.

8vo .

\$1.75

"No conception of the real status of Turkey is possible unless something is understood of 'the interlacing and alternation of the separate and unblending races.' . . . Such an understanding is admirably presented in Prof. Ramsay's book, which gives a near and trustworthy insight into actual Turkish conditions."  
—*N. Y. Times*.

## WAS CHRIST BORN AT BETHLEHEM?

A Study in the Credibility of St. Luke. Part I. The Importance of the Problem. Part II. The Solution of the Problem. 8vo, \$1.75

"The work is one of which students of biblical criticism will need to take account. It is absolutely candid and straightforward, thorough and discriminating, and courteous to other scholars whose conclusions it sees most reason to condemn. It is a fine piece of work."  
—*The Congregationalist*.

## HISTORICAL COMMENTARY UPON THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

8vo

\$3.00

---

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

